R E P O R T R E S U M E S

ED 016 593 RE 001 120

IDENTIFYING AND MEETING THE INDIVIDUAL NEEDS OF CHILDREN IN READING, STATE-WIDE READING WORKSHOP (LINCOLN, NEBRASKA, MARCH 31 - APRIL 1, 1967). FINAL REPORT.

BY- CAREFOOT, JUDITH
MID-CONTINENT REG. EDUC. LAB. INC,KANSAS CITY, MO.
NEBRASKA STATE DEPT. OF EDUCATION, LINCOLN

PUB DATE 67

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.50 HC-$2.96 72P.

DESCRIPTORS- *TEACHER WORKSHOPS, *READING INSTRUCTION, *TEACHING TECHNIQUES, *INDIVIDUAL NEEDS, READING DIFFICULTY, *REMEDIAL READING, CORRECTIVE READING, CREATIVE READING, CRITICAL READING,

DURING EACH OF THE FOUR SESSIONS REPORTED, A READING EXPERT SPOKE ON ONE OF THE FOLLOWING TOPICS--(1) REMEDIAL READING, (2) THE MID-CONTINENTAL REGIONAL EDUCATIONAL LABORATORY READING PROGRAM AND MEETING INDIVIDUAL NEEDS, (3) READING AS REASONING, AND (4) THE CONTROVERSY OVER INSTRUCTIONAL TECHNIQUES. THE PARTICIPANTS DISCUSSED EACH TOPIC EXTENSIVELY IN SMALL DISTILLATION GROUPS AND ELECTED REPRESENTATIVES TO A PANEL DISCUSSION WHICH ENDED EACH SESSION. IT WAS RESOLVED THAT REMEDIAL READING SHOULD BE A PART OF DAILY INSTRUCTION, THAT READING DIFFICULTIES COULD BE PREVENTED THROUGH A BALANCED, FLEXIBLE, AND CONTINUOUS READING PROGRAM, THAT READING SHOULD BE TAUGHT AS A REASONING PROCESS, AND THAT TEACHERS SHOULD LOOK FOR THE TECHNIQUE OR COMBINATION OF TECHNIQUES BY WHICH EACH CHILD LEARNS BEST. THIS REPORT ALSO INCLUDED THE QUESTIONS ASKED, THE PROBLEMS UNRESOLVED, THE RESOLUTIONS MADE, AND THE RECOMMENDATIONS GIVEN DURING EACH OF THE FOUR SESSIONS. THIS DOCUMENT IS THE FINAL REPORT OF THE STATE-WIDE READING WORKSHOP (LINCOLN, NEBRASKA, MARCH 31-APRIL 1, 1967). (NS)

ERIC

ED016593

* CONFERENCE REPORT

identifying and meeting the INDIVIDUAL NEEDS OF CHILDREN in reading

002059

Carefoot, Judith

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

RE 001 120

Mid-continent Regional Educational Laboratory
Lincoln Area Center
Kenneth E. Shibata, Coordinator
Lincoln, Nebraska 68508

State of Nebraska
DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Floyd A. Miller, Commissioner
State Capitol, Lincoln, Nebraska 68509

THE FINAL REPORT

OF THE

STATE-WIDE READING WORKSHOP

ON

IDENTIFYING AND MEETING THE INDIVIDUAL NEEDS OF CHILDREN

Held at

General Arnold Elmentary School
Lincoln Air Force Base
Lincoln, Nebraska

March 31 - April 1, 1967

Sponsored by

The State Department of Education
State Capitol
Lincoln, Nebraska

In Cooperation With

McREL, University of Omaha,
University of Nebraska, and the Lincoln Public Schools

Prepared by

Judith Carefoot
Research Review Specialist
Mid-continent Regional Educational Laboratory

Issued by

Mid-continent Regional Educational Laboratory
Kenneth E. Shibata, Coordinator
Lincoln Area Center, Lincoln, Nebraska 68508

In Cooperation with

The Division of Instructional Services
Nebraska State Department of Education
LeRoy Ortgiesen
Assistant Commissioner

State Capitol 1967 Lincoln, Nebraska

COMMITTEE MEMBERS

John H. Query, Jr., Director
State Reading Workshop
State Department of Education

Dr. Alma Homze
Professor of Education
University of Nebraska

Dr. Donald Cushenbery
Director, Reading Clinic
University of Omaha

Mr. Ron Meyer
Director, Reading Clinic
University of Omaha

Mrs. Roma Hiatt
Consultant
Scott-Foresman

Miss Edith Pembrook
Director, Lincoln Speech
& Reading Center for
Teachers

Mr. Lawrence Lemons
Director of Instruction
Scottsbluff Public Schools

Mr. Loren Brakenhoff
Director, Elementary
Education
State Department of Education

Mr. Robert Baden
Consultant in English
State Department of Education

Dr. John Ewing
Professor of Education
University of Nebraska

Dr. Kenneth Shibata
Lincoln Coordinator
Mid-continent Regional Educational Laboratory

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

It would be dishonest to issue this report without thanking those persons whose names do not appear on the cover or the title page, but who, nevertheless, made vital contributions to the success of the workshop and the compilation of the report:

Mr. Jack Query, Consultant in Reading and Elementary Education to the State Department of Education, who, as director of the workshop, selected and arranged for the speakers and organized the proceedings.

Miss Connie Maun and Mrs. Linda Watkins, secretaries to Mr. Query and Dr. Shibata, respectively, who organized and carried out the registration procedures. Miss Maun transcribed several of the speeches and Mrs. Watkins typed the manuscript for the final report.

Mrs. Pauline Landman, secretary to Mr. James McDowell, Omaha Coordinator for McREL, who assisted Miss Maun and Mrs. Watkins at registration.

Mr. F.D. (Duke) Slater, writer and assistant to Mr. McDowell, who assisted at registration and provided a vivid written description of the proceedings in the Omaha Area Center Newsletter.

Mr. Jerry Gruber, assistant to Dr. Shibata, who assisted at registration and arranged many of the details involved in the organization of the workshop.

Misses Linda Henline, Sandra Law and Barbara Ahlschwede and Mrs. JoAnn Fosnaugh, who acted as guides and ushers to the teachers participating in the workshop.

The recorders of the distillation groups whose work-sheets provided the information on which the report was based.

Mrs. Dorothy Redfern of Oconto, Nebraska, whose tape recordings of the workshop were invaluable in compiling the report.

Judith Carefoot

TABLE OF CONTENTS

*Incomplete - See Appendix D.

STATEWIDE READING WORKSHOP

General Arnold School
March 31-April 1, 1967

BACKGROUND

The idea of the reading workshop was developed jointly by the State Department of Education and the Mid-continent Regional Educational Laboratory. Its ultimate goal was to improve the teaching of reading in Nebraska by bringing together classroom teachers of reading and nationally recognized experts in the field of reading. Mr. Jack Query, Reading Consultant to the State Department of Education and Dr. Kenneth Shibata, Lincoln Coordinator for the Mid-continent Regional Educational Laboratory (McREL) were, with the assistance of their secretaries, responsible for the organization of the workshop. Financing was provided by the State Department of Education, McREL and the registration fees paid by the individuals attending the workshop.

ORGANIZATION

The workshop program included speeches by four authorities in the field of reading: Dr. Sterl Artley, Professor of Education at the University of Missouri; Dr. Richard Watson, Professor of Education, Kansas State College and Reading Consultant for McREL; Dr. George Spache, Professor of Education and Director of the Reading Clinic, University of Florida; and Dr. Dorothy Kendall Bracken, Director of the Reading Clinic at Southern Methodist University. Each speaker dealt with one aspect of the teaching

of reading. The workshop was divided into four sessions, one morning and one afternoon session for each of the two days involved. Following the introduction of each speaker and the speech itself, the teachers attending the workshop divided into "distillation groups" to discuss the speech and points or questions raised by the speech. The session then ended with a panel discussion involving the speaker and representatives from the "distillation groups."

The specific objectives of the workshop, as identified by Mr. Query were:

OBJECTIVES

1. To identify specific techniques in the teaching of reading and to implement them in the classroom situation.

2. To share ideas and common problems in the teaching of reading.

3. To disseminate knowledge gathered to the teachers throughout the state of Nebraska.

4. To acknowledge that reading is a skill that is used in all content subject areas.

5. To develop an awareness that new techniques are constantly being developed.

While these objectives are essentially the objectives of a classroom teacher of reading, they are not always so clearly outlined and identified and, of course, their achievement is often difficult because of lack of opportunity. The Reading Workshop, it is felt, provided this opportunity for teachers to meet and exchange ideas and develop new ideas from the presentations of the four major speakers.

THE SPEAKERS

The first of the speakers, Dr. Artley, concentrated on remedial reading with the feeling that remedial reading should be regarded as a part of all phases of the reading program. Essentially, Dr. Artley, whose speech was entitled "The Fence at the Top of the Cliff," regarded prevention of reading problems as more vital than remedying the problems after they appear. Perhaps his philosophy could be best expressed by saying that the remedial reading teacher's job is that of making her job unnecessary. He followed his discussion of the philosophy of remedial reading with suggestions for preventing difficulties in reading -- building the fence, as it were. An outline of Dr. Artley's speech, prepared by Dr. Artley, is included.

Dr. Watson, the speaker for Friday afternoon, titled his talk "A Promise to Keep," and discussed the McREl reading program which, he emphasized, in spite of its defects and the hastiness with which it was erected, has merit, and should not be summarily abandoned because of the demise of the McREL Area Centers. The promise to be kept, as Dr. Watson sees it, is to meet the individual differences of children as effectively and as promptly as possible. Dr. Watson discusses various methods of approaching this problem and several aspects of the problem. The text of his speech is included.

Dr. Spache, on Saturday morning, spoke about "Reasoning in Reading." He equated reasoning and comprehension and listed five components of reasoning. He emphasized the importance of stimulating children to read and of evaluating their reading progress.

Dr. Bracken, the final speaker, discussed the methods in "The Methods Controversy." After outlining the three methods historically used to teach reading -- alphabet, phonics, and word phrase and sentence recognition, she contended that all three methods had merit as well as defects, and that no one method was adequate to any child. Further, she argued, combinations of the three methods should be tailored to the individual needs of the pupils. In short, rigid use of any one method will rarely work. Rigid use of any one combination of the three methods will rarely work. Attention to and understanding of individual differences in children learning to read will work, if applied consistently and earnestly.

THE DISTILLATION GROUPS

Following each of the speeches small groups of teachers met in each of twenty rooms in the school. Their purpose was to discuss the speech, to raise pertinent points, ask pertinent questions, and, where possible, to resolve these questions and points. Each group elected a chairman and recorder, the latter being provided with a recorder's worksheet on which to outline the topics of the discussion in the group. From the records of these discussions, a fairly complete description of the reactions to the ideas presented by the principal speeches is available. They provide the substance of this report, the result of bringing together Nebraska teachers of reading and recognized authorities in the field.

CHAIRMAN AND RECORDERS OF THE DISTILLATION GROUPS

Room Number	Chairman	Recorder
Library	Marie Clarke	Ruth Hoff
118	Mae Clark, Friday A.M. Mae Clark, Friday P.M. Mae Clark, Saturday A.M. Gwendolyn Hodges, Saturday P.M.	Nettie M. Clark
119	Pat Bechenhauer	Glenn Shaneyfelt
123	Edith Pembrook, Friday A.M. Friday P.M. Hildegard Person, Saturday A.M. Edith Pembrook, Saturday P.M.	Irene A. Odell
124	Alma Iwohn	Dolores Mather
125	Clara Beesly	Mildred A. Hassell
126	Jeanne Marsh	Ella Hahlweg
127	Joe McKeone	Mildred Boyd
129	Loren Brakenhoff, Friday A.M. Dorcas Cavit, Friday P.M. Dorcas Cavit, Saturday A.M. Mrs. Heitgard, Saturday P.M.	Helen Hinze
130	Johanna Kasl	Sharon Wilson
131	Jean Buck	Vivian Miller
132	Elma Lohrenz	Wanda Wittmuss
134	Albin Bosn	Rose Prystai
140	Carolyn Jones	Linda Gehrig
141	Dr. John Ewing	Zola Gardner
143	Marjorie Decker	Evalee Atkins
240	Mrs. Richard Orman	Darlene L. Rischling
241	Alice Kalkwarf	Irene Leahy
242	Erma Hinds, Friday A.M. Erma Hinds, Friday P.M. Erma Hinds, Saturday A.M. Erma Burk, Saturday P.M.	Evelyn Darling, Fri.A.M. Evelyn Darling, Fri.P.M. Judy Dondlinger, Sat.A.M. Darlene Lee, Sat. P.M.
243	Virgie Chudamelka	Lois Ostruske

SESSION I - Friday, March 31, 1967 - A.M.

The first session opened with a brief introductory talk by John H. Query, Jr., the Consultant on Reading and Elementary Education to the Department of Education. He was followed by Dr. LeRoy Ortgiesen, Assistant Commissioner of Education for the State of Nebraska. Dr. Donald Cushenbery then made the presentation of I.R.A. Presidents, with an introduction by Mr. Query.

The preliminary exercises were followed by the first speech on the program, that of Dr. Sterl Artley.

PREVENTING READING DIFFICULTIES
"The Fence at the Top of the Cliff"

I. Introduction - basic assumptions

A. Unless steps are taken to prevent reading problems, federally supported remedial programs will be a perennial necessity.

B. Reading problems are caused, they don't happen by chance or whim. If they are caused, they can be prevented.

C. A remedial teacher's job should be that of making her work unnecessary.

II. Suggestions for preventing difficulties

A. An effective program of reading readiness, giving attention in particular to

1. Oral language development
2. Auditory discrimination
3. Visual discrimination

B. Making diagnosis of difficulties and their correction a part of everyday teaching

1. Detecting problems through the directed reading lesson and the use of the workbook
2. Making use of special help groups for individual work

C. Incorporating into the reading program a sound ongoing program of word perception with attention to

1. Context
2. Word structure

3. Phonics
4. Dictionary

D. Giving concerted attention to the development of reading interests and tastes - growth through reading as well as growth in reading.

E. Building up the school's control library with quality materials.

Following Dr. Artley's speech, the attending teachers broke up into small discussion groups. The discussions were recorded under the following headings: main points discussed, main points asked, pertinent points resolved, pertinent points not resolved, new ideas presented relevant to the main topic. A summary of the discussions regarding Dr. Artley's speech follows.

I. Main Points Discussed

A. Diagnosis of Reading Problems

1. The need for continual diagnosis
2. Various methods may be used:
   a. Basic reading tests
   b. Teacher observation
   c. Subjective inventory tests
   d. Workbooks

B. Reading Readiness

1. Methods used by various schools to deal with the problem.
2. The advisability of early reading instruction--the group meeting in the library, chaired by Marie Clarke, felt that this can be a mistake.
3. Individuality of reading readiness.
4. The connection between reading readiness and troublesome or slow students.

C. Remedial Reading

1. Importance of starting in the first grade.
2. Possibility of its being helped by non-grading.
3. The importance of beginning with diagnosis.
4. The importance of the relationship between the remedial reading teacher and the classroom teacher.
5. The necessity of staff cooperation and a positive attitude of the whole staff to remedial reading.

D. Individualization of Instruction

1. The difficulty of finding time for individualized instruction because of extra-curricular demands.
2. The necessity of a lower pupil-teacher ratio.
3. The need for more individualized materials on all levels.
4. The advisability of smaller class loads in grade one to reduce the development of reading problems.
5. The fact that most work is geared toward the average.
6. The question of reading groups as opposed to teacher reading to the class as a whole.
7. The need for more classroom help.

E. Prevention of Reading Problems

1. The necessity of starting preventive measures early.
2. The possibility of reading instruction in kindergarten.
3. The development of prevention programs from existing remedial programs.
4. The handicapping of prevention programs by a lessening of concern in the upper grades about reading readiness.

F. Staff Considerations in Dealing with Reading Problems

1. The demands made on staff time by extra-curricular activities.
2. The necessity for total communication among the teachers in the entire school.
3. The need for more in-service programs.
4. The need among teachers for more freedom to exercise their own judgement.
5. The necessity of sharing of ideas.
6. The need for teachers to welcome observers and student teachers into their classrooms.
7. The necessity for more leadership from principals in the diagnosis of problems.

G. Aids in the Teaching of Reading

1. Standardized tests - ITA, Peabody Picture Vocabulary, etc.
2. Programmed reading programs.
3. Visual aids.
4. Auditory aids.
5. The school library -- more funds are needed; a current pamphlet file would be useful.

H. Special Reading Problems

1. The development of comprehension.
2. The development of interest and attitudes.
3. The development of a vocabulary:
   a. The size of the class depends on pupil's mastery of vocabulary.
   b. The use of dramatization or action as techniques in the building of vocabulary.
   c. Teaching of vocabulary for all areas of learning.
4. The problem of choice of materials for the child who can read at a higher grade level.
5. The development of a method for dealing with new words.

II. Main Questions Asked

1. How can ideas concerning the teaching of reading be spread to Nebraska schools?
2. What is the ideal number of reading groups in a room?
3. How much time is needed to determine the instructional level of pupils?
4. How does a teacher in a small system decide how to distinguish between pupils needing remedial work and retarded pupils?
5. How may "immature" children be detected before kindergarten?
6. How large should a first grade class be?
7. What constitutes a "formal" reading program?
8. Has any consideration been given to the idea of starting reading instruction a year earlier for girls than than boys?
9. How may the literature part of an English program be fitted in with Project English in Nebraska?
10. What measures may be taken to interest reluctant readers?
11. What level of training is required of a reading consultant?
12. How may problems in visual perception be handled?
13. Is it better to have teachers or pupils correct workbooks?

III. Pertinent Points Resolved

1. Remedial teaching is good basic teaching involving diagnosis of problems and attempts to solve the problems. It should begin in grade one or possibly in kindergarten and continue on to the upper levels with no stigma attached. Diagnosis of all pupils should be carried out so that potential problems may be identified. Individual help and instruction with attention to individual rates and levels of development, is of paramount importance in successful teaching of reading and remedial work.

2. Because the teacher is the key to reading instruction, more attention must be paid to teacher training and teachers must utilize the generally adequate training that they now receive. Reading specialists are most effective in helping teachers and should be so utilized.

3. Reading readiness is of basic importance and a set of criteria was developed by the group meeting in Room 123, chaired by Miss Edith Pembrook of the Lincoln Public Schools:

   a. Information gained from the cumulative record and previous teachers.
   b. A survey test with the child being placed at least six months behind the grade placement indicated by the test.
   c. The Informal Reading Inventory.
   d. The Dolch Word List (Teaching Primary Reading, p. 255)
   e. Basic Reader Mastery Test.

4. Time is a crucial element in effective teaching of reading, in determining reading readiness, and in diagnosing and remedying reading problems. Teachers must have time to diagnose and assess and to group. It was noted that the "low" reading group frequently is the most time-consuming group.

5. The choice and use of materials should be left largely to the teachers, with the understanding that their uses and purposes be clear to both teacher and pupils, and tests may serve both diagnostic and remedial purposes.

6. The library is a useful tool in teaching reading. It should be used as a developmental device with kindergarten children permitted free use. It is important that the librarian appreciate the value of such freedom and be more interested in fostering interest in reading than in merely looking after the books. Probably the development of interest in, and appreciation of, reading is the most important function of the school library. Literature should be treated as one, with no attempt to separate "good literature" and thus trigger students' defense mechanisms against reading.

7. Activities, such as listening posts, and sensory activities preceding motivating questions, are useful devices.

8. Vital to the successful reading program is understanding of each other's functions by teachers at various levels, the cooperation and support of the administration.

IV. Pertinent Points Not Resolved

1. Criteria for classifying children as requiring remedial work.
2. The appropriateness and adequacy of ITA as a good reading program.
3. The most effective procedure for handling a child who has not completed a grade level.
4. The most effective method of grouping -- by ability, or by ability within grades.
5. The most effective method of evaluating and fulfilling individual needs.
6. The most effective way of making school boards and administrators aware of the need for libraries and librarians.
7. The most effective method for establishing rapport and mutual cooperation between classroom teachers and teachers of reading.
8. The way to make available to teachers more room for individualized instruction.
9. The extent to which reading machines should be used.
10. The reason(s) for the decline experienced by some children between the early primary grades and the later secondary grades.
11. The most effective method for the teacher to resolve the conflict caused by the asking of guiding questions and the freedom of creative responses.

V. New Ideas Presented Relevant to the Main Topic

1. The use of a modified Joplin Plan in which the children operate in an ungraded reading program -- leaving their rooms to go to other rooms.
2. Homogeneous grouping, practiced continuously, among rooms.
3. Frequent parental misunderstanding of the differences between remedial work and enrichment.
4. The connection between speech, auditory work and spelling should be observed and utilized.
5. If a structural linguistics program is started in the first grade, it must be followed through.
6. Planning of the reading program might be circular rather than unilateral and include parents as well as teachers.
7. The teacher might use book markers containing the childrens' names and individual difficulties. These markers could serve as reminders of children needing special help when the appropriate skills are being taught.

8. A reading committee might be established in the school system to provide recommendations and solutions.
9. A new curriculum might be developed each year, building on previous curricula.
10. Teacher aides could be utilized for individualized help.
11. The "extended day" program could be used with small groups in disadvantaged areas.
12. After-school tutoring programs, with volunteer tutors, might prove helpful.

VI. Recommendations Made by the "Distillation Groups"

1. That formal instruction in kindergarten is inadvisable unless the entire class is definitely "ready."
2. That teachers view innovations critically, judging them on their merit.
3. That provisions be made for adequate and effective library facilities. Mentioned as possible prototypes and sources of help were the Learning Resource Center at Red Oak, Iowa and the Lancaster County Multi-Grade School.
4. That more time be given to reading in the lower elementary school, possible at the expense of some other activity.
5. That writing be given its full value as a key to good reading.
6. That teachers utilize available materials.
7. That more workshops of this nature, on both statewide and local levels, be conducted.

On the whole, reactions to Dr. Artley's speech were enthusiastic. The points raised and questions asked indicated the sincere interest of the group in discussing reading and in learning from each other.

Questions Asked Dr. Artley

1. How can we deal with children who are, in effect, retarded?

ANSWER: Avoid setting deadlines for achievement with such children. Let them proceed at their own pace and achieve within their own limitations.

2. What is the relationship between reading and writing?

ANSWER: There has always been a tendency to dichotomize and compartmentalize the Language Arts. Research in the area indicates many "lines of support" from one to another. For example, in the "readiness area" an important activity would be experience stories with the children suggesting and the teacher writing so that the

children can see the relationship between narration and writing. Reading, writing, speaking, and listening are mutually supportive. They should not be jumbled since more concentration in one area is frequently necessary, but we must draw from one to support anothe and apply principles from one area to other areas.

SESSION II - Friday, March 31, 1967 - P.M.

The second speaker, Dr. Richard Watson, was introduced by Dr. Kenneth Shibata, Lincoln Coordinator of McREL. The text of Dr. Watson's speech is included here.

A PROMISE TO KEEP

What can you as a teacher do to effectively meet the individual differences of children? Here we are dealing with philosophy rather than the technique. We have seen team teaching and ungraded primary, what are we trying to do, really? I contend that even though we are moving away from it organizationally we are trying to get back to the philosophy which pervaded the one room school house; where individual differences had to be attended to; where a teacher could look out in her class and realize that individual differences existed. This is what we are really trying to do and it doesn't make any difference if you put a super-structure called team teaching or whether you put a super-structure called ungraded primary, or ungraded elementary if you haven't changed the philosophy of the people involved to match the administrative changes that are taking place. You haven't really done much to effect a different attitude toward individual differences.

I would suggest that one thing necessary to carry through what I am saying and what Dr. Artley said this morning, is that what we need are teachers who are problem solving oriented. As a college instructor this bothers me a great deal and I have tried to incorporate much of the inductive processes in my teaching, hoping that part of the method would make some dent in terms of problem solving, but I think we should look to individual children who have some pattern of strength and weakness to find the place we need to begin. Then we need to think in terms of alternatives for alleviating the problems of each of these children.

Finally I think we have to be honest and courageous enough to make a commitment to an alternative and this is where many of us falter. We need to make a professional judgment. We need to carry through the alternative that we have selected. We need to carefully evaluate, as a continuous process, the kinds of changes that are taking place with the children we are teaching.

In meeting individual differences we need to show that we are concerned with the problems of our fellow teachers. Each method of instruction, each pattern of instruction within the classroom leads to a specific pattern of strengths and weaknesses within children. Let us recognize this. Let us begin to play off the weaknesses we feel are inherent in the children as they come to us, thereby building diversity rather than conformity into our elementary and secondary school programs. Each one of you should look to the pattern of strengths and weaknesses created by the teachers who precede you and play toward that so that you can add some semblance of balance to the program which is being created.

We have an elementary laboratory school at Kansas State College. Two years ago the principal said, "Let's sit down and really evaluate what is happening to our kids in reading. Let's find out what we are really doing." So I looked at this program. We had the teachers supply us with the things which they used and which they thought were most effective. We watched them teach. We actually appraised the degree of disability in our school. We looked at it from about every angle you could look at it from. Frankly, when we got finished, had we looked at any one teacher as an individual, we probably would have fired her, but as we looked at the total school product, we were extremely convinced that what was happening was pretty sound. We found a balanced program built on teacher creativity and diversity. I think this is what we need to do more of, and I think out of this will come a greater level of respect for one another.

I think we need to accept a broader definition for the term "innovation". We have heard so much about innovation that it is almost a nasty word. What we have always thought of as innovation is something startlingly new, exceptionally different; something that has never been done before. I contend that most of the schools that I visit don't need this kind of innovation. We don't have to test ITA, we don't have to do anything really fantastic in terms of grouping. What we do need to do is to incorporate into those programs things which will improve those programs and which are innovative to us in that we have never done them before; things which would offer some progress for changing what we are doing in a positive fashion.

By and large in a democratic free society, what two things do we value most in our citizenry? As I look at it, one of these is that we want people to be able to make critical judgments on their own. The second thing we need in terms of citizenship is a group of people who are able to come up with creative ways of solving new problems. What happens as we look at our programs in terms of reading skills? By and large we are doing a job of teaching receptive reading. That is, we teach kids how to get the facts, or to get the main idea; to actually mimic

or recall those things that they run into. Do we make intentional effort, most of us, to teach kids how to think as they read? To apply, to evaluate? Do we really teach kids to do something creative with their reading skills? How to use these ideas as they critically evaluate or as a springboard for new ideas? I don't think so!

Innovation, in terms of creative reading, is getting a student to think of something in a way he never thought of, or finding a new solution to an old problem. It doesn't take any gadgetry. Basically you are teaching people to do either receptive critical or creative reading in the way in which you ask questions and to the degree you ask questions. I contend we should teach critical reading by asking the children to look at sets of questions initially, and this can take place in the third grade or fourth grade; we can even do it in kindergarten. In a sense what we are talking about here is Jerome Bruner's Spiral Curriculum; that we can teach anything if we can get it into the language of the child we are trying to teach. When we ask him "what," "when," "where," "how," questions we are asking for receptive kinds of things. When we ask "why" and "how" we are into the critical. When we ask people to imagine or "what would you do if," we are getting into the creative. These questions need to be put to children before they are asked to read. Eventually we can ask children to generate questions through the survey of material. Finally, you as a teacher, can say "I don't want you to write any questions; I don't want you to work on the questions I have prepared. Today I want you to survey and think of the questions you could ask and then read to find the answers."

I think we need to attempt to build a reading program that has three component parts: I think we need balanced programs, flexible programs, and continuous programs. Let me point out some generalizations in this regard. What do we mean by a balanced program? Oftentimes we think of this as a shot-gun where if we put out enough pellets of varying skills everybody will get some of each. This is not what I mean by balance. I am thinking of balance in regard to building individual programs for children from a diagnosis of skills. We interpret balance in terms of skills to be taught to the child and the mode of presentation of these skills (i.e., the sensory mode). We have been flooding audio and visual senses in reading and we need to give consideration to a practical application of kinesthetic and tactile approaches with children in groups.

I think we need to pay attention to the way in which we group. I think we have to look away from our three reading group procedure. I think we have to go to a more flexible type of grouping which may be based on interest or particular skill weaknesses which children can temporarily be taken into and out of when the skill is accomplished. I think we have to build pro-

grams that use individualized materials and allow children to proceed at their own rate; one-group activities would allow us to share some common feelings or interest and develop discussion from it. I think we need to work with groups that have an activity which is their own that they can share with others. Balance can be built for children in this way.

In terms of flexibility, what does this really mean? Flexibility has to do with the way in which you teach; the climate which you create in your classroom. I think this is extremely important especially as we look back to the first grade studies that were made a few years ago. The thing that really makes a difference in terms of how effectively your students learn is how effectively you as a teacher teach. It doesn't make any difference really what kind of system you use. The approach is always tendered by the teacher's personality. On one end of this flexibility continuum we have incidental teaching. Incidental teaching is typified by the teacher who comes in in the morning and says, "Well, what are we going to do today?" On the other end of the continuum we have the teacher who is convinced that the earth would crumble if she wasn't on page 269 in the Health book by Christmas vacation. Knowing that this continuum will continue to exist, what I am asking you to do is get yourselves in the middle. If you are concerned about your flexibility and where you fall on this scale, I trust that your heart is in the right place and you are going to make that judgment which will make a better teacher out of you just knowing this is the way it is.

What do we mean by continuity? Starting from where he is and taking him as far as he can go. Basically we have assigned some things along this continuum called readiness, learning to read, reading to learn, study skills. My contention is that when you really build continuity in conjunction with balance, you are looking at each one of these skills in relation to the position of a student, not as a definitive point of reading readiness accomplished by first grade, learning to read by third grade, reading to learn from there on up, study skills emphasized in junior high probably as an adult reading for interest. The idea is rather to find continuity for each of these skills and in building balance in this program everywhere. The real problem that we need to solve is "how" and "what kind of." You need to phrase your total program in relation to how you are doing this continuous job as you move children along.

Finally, I think we have to guarantee intake in the content area. I think this is especially true in junior high and senior high schools. What do we mean to guarantee intake? Let me give you an example. A group of vocational technical people came to me about two weeks ago and asked me to do an analysis of readability on textbooks they were using. I did the best job I could and came out with 13th grade level. Then they presented me with the real

bombshell. The kids that are taking these courses all fall between 5th and 8th grade reading level. I think our real problem here, and this is not only in automotives and plastics, but in Biology, History and Science, is that we supply remedial instruction for these kids and while they are taking remedial reading they drop from a D to an F in Biology. They drop out of school because they can't find a thing they can really take ahold of in other course work. What I am saying here is that we have to provide staying power for these kids. These kids are just as bright as the typical reading child. Actually our spectrum of I.Q. would probably be somewhat normal for our disabled readers.

The fact is that they can make judgments and they do carry many specialized types of vocabulary. All you need to do is give them a "system for survival" in high school so that they can persist.

They can listen to a group of tape recordings, for instance. I contend that if you took that Biology text, broke it up into units, put these units on tapes, and supplied these kids with a group of critical or receptive types of questions in a little handout that went along with it, you could incorporate those kids into discussion groups and you might be startled with some of the generalizations and understandings that they would come out with. You have to guarantee intake. It can't always be done on tape. This is one way to do it, but it would get rather boring for a student to sit down for six hours a day listening to tapes. We have to find additional ways to guarantee intake.

As an educator you have one job that you need to do more than any of these, and that is to establish priorities for yourself. What is the most important thing you have to do this year and next year? What are the things that are sort of incidental, that you don't really need to care too much about? Each of us as an educator should have some priorities and the high priorities we should cling to with a passion. We should lay our job on the line. We should commit ourselves and dedicate ourselves to fulfilling the highest priority items that we see.

Individualized differences and a commitment to these differences is one of these priorities for me. There are a whole lot of other things from gym shoes to chewing gum that I would trade in order to increase individual differences. I don't want all my priorities to look alike to my administrator. I want him to look at the things I ask for, and from the intensity of my demands, I want him to know what I value in education and in the field of reading.

We have a promise to keep, and this promise has to do with increased educational opportunities for children through meeting individual differences. I certainly don't want to conclude with you this afternoon that this is an easy process, but only that it is a worthwhile one.

I. Main Points Discussed

A. Teaching of Reading

1. The similarity of team teaching, as discussed by the National Teacher Corps, to interning, which helps the teacher by dealing with small groups.
2. Dr. Spache's contention that grouping on the continuous growth principle, concentrating on one grade a year, could be successful.
3. The misunderstanding of the purpose and usefulness of teaching machines, which actually increase speed fixations, but not eye span.
4. The difficulty to teachers of achieving the goal of individualized instruction.
5. Preventive versus remedial aspects of the reading program.
6. Evaluation of reading programs.
7. The qualifications of remedial reading teachers.
8. The need for clinical services for extreme cases, children who have psychological problems inhibiting their ability to learn.
9. The necessity of teaching reading along with each subject which has its own specialized vocabulary.
10. The inadvisability of stressing speed reading below the sixth grade level.
11. The inadvisability of over-loading elementary school children.
12. The limiting of oral reading to re-reading of what has been read silently.
13. Curriculum guides.
14. The difficulty to the teacher of coping with many levels of understanding in the classroom.
15. The need to discover the child's interests and capitalize on them.
16. The necessity for flexibility, balance, and continuity in a school program.
17. The problem of covering basic assigned material while dealing with individualized instruction.
18. The need for each teacher to use methods best suited to herself.
19. Creative reading.
20. The difficulty of establishing priorities and fighting to keep them.

21. Ways of guaranteeing intake.
22. The importance of the development of auditory skills.
23. The merit of an advanced group in kindergarten.

B. Possible Aids to Teachers of Reading

1. Teaching machines.
2. The school library - how to build, maintain, and use it.
3. The role of teacher's aides.
4. The failure of many teachers to use available audio-visual aids.
5. The practice of building a word collection, perhaps in flash cards from words learned during field trips.

C. Teacher Training

1. Preparation by colleges of teachers of reading.
2. Making high school teachers into reading teachers.
3. In-service programs.
4. Programs offered by colleges to aid teachers.
5. The use of the first few years of teaching as a learning period.
6. The need to make student teaching experience more meaningful.

D. Staff-Administration Relations

1. The lack of encouragement for outstanding work from superintendents and administrators.
2. The recruitment of leaders from the ranks of teachers.
3. The dangers involved in judging a teacher outside of the total school situation.
4. Teacher-teacher relationships.
5. The need to give the beginning teacher the "breaks" in choice of pupils, classroom space, and teaching materials.

II. Main Questions Asked

1. What is the National Teacher Corps? (Answer: Teacher-trainees, being trained by field experience, supplementary to teachers in disadvantaged areas. Each team is led by an experienced teacher, and the other team members are student teachers taking university courses in addition to their teaching experience.)
2. How can the machinery of multi-use material be set up for an individual approach? (Answer: It was suggested by the Library Group that the teacher use a check list with each pupil to avoid the necessity of spending time with each pupil each day.)

3. How does the contract plan work? (Answer: Dr. Spache feels that the project method is too formal and that a preferable approach is to make assignments so the child can work independently.)
4. How much in-service time was needed for the Ashville plan? (Answer: Several days, with demonstrations and few lectures. Actually working in the classroom with the teachers was found most effective.)
5. How can a teacher handle the problem of a child who is making no progress? (Answer: Place the child near the teacher and add others who choose to join the group; after a time, let them work together in preparing skits.)
6. What time allotment is recommended, and does it slight anything? (Answer: A move may be made toward individualized reading, although few teachers manage individualized reading and teaching in less than five years.)
7. Does this plan alleviate the boredom of junior high school? (Answer: The teacher lets the pupils proceed at their own pace(s), a motivating technique; self-evaluation is used.)
8. How may a library staffed with only a part-time librarian be more effectively utilized?
9. How may we guard against wasting funds on gadgets?
10. How can teachers' aides be utilized?
11. How can the information from this workshop be distributed to schools when the administration allots no time for a report?
12. What is meant by establishing priorities?
13. How can we guarantee intake? (Answer: Closer communication with teachers; meeting with subject area teachers; steps in learning to read; determination of levels of the textbooks.
14. How does a teacher, charged with developing an in-service program, begin?
15. When should ability grouping be started?
16. Why are classroom teachers not invited to participate in seminars following student teaching?
17. Is there a guide or program for a corrective reading program?
18. How can teachers be trained to teach inductively?
19. How can communication between administration and classroom teachers be established?
20. How can material be provided for reluctant readers?
21. What is meant by "educate?" Can we "educate" all students?
22. Is it necessary to correct all work done by students, and if so, how often?
23. Do beginning teachers have a feeling of inferiority?
24. How can pupils of less ability be given a feeling of accomplishment and satisfaction?

25. Are we veering toward departmentalization or specialization?
26. Are year-round in-service programs an added burden?
27. How can teachers make publishers realize that their texts are not suitable to all grade levels?
28. How can superior students be encouraged to work to their potential?
29. How can teachers avoid neglecting bright and gifted children?
30. How can individualization be reconciled with the scope and sequence of learning?

III. Pertinent Points Resolved

1. While few teachers present had experienced team teaching, many expressed an interest in the technique as a means of improving effectiveness in all areas.
2. Oral reading should be treated cautiously since a poor reader can provide a poor example for all pupils.
3. It is a misconception that the teacher must be present during all attempts at individualized reading.
4. Since basic readers overlap only approximately 40%, and since 80% of basic word lists are within the framework of 200 words, there is considerable confusion as to what is the most important set of words to be learned first.
5. Preventive (or developmental) reading is important.
6. Students need the opportunity and knowledge to select library books.
7. While reading specialists are needed to diagnose problems, classroom teachers must do the teaching.
8. Remedial reading teachers must guard against allowing their classes to become "dumping grounds" for deviates.
9. Enthusiasm for the reading programs is more important than the materials used.
10. Teachers are asking for help and should be applauded, not criticized, for doing so.
11. More demonstrations of the use of audio-visual materials are needed.
12. Teachers frequently avoid using machines because of a fear of possible mechanical breakdowns.
13. Teachers need encouragement to try new things.
14. More principal visits to classrooms are needed.
15. Teachers should avoid asking too many objective questions - pupils need time to think.
16. Teaching creatively is difficult; circumstances must be right.
17. The teacher must establish a one-to-one relationship with the child.
18. Machines must be used cautiously. Teachers should avoid using them for busywork.

19. Worse than the dropout is the student who stays in school and vegetates.
20. More training in inductive teaching is necessary.
21. Children must learn how to read and to think.
22. More in-service programs are needed.
23. Teachers must improve their own reading.
24. There is a need for the practical observations of student teachers.
25. We cannot educate all children by the same standards.
26. Teachers should be more concerned over the image that they present to parents.
27. More high interest material at a low reading level is needed.
28. More individualization of instruction with gifted students could extend skills in outlining, note-taking, research, etc.

IV. Pertinent Points Not Resolved

1. How to avoid the tendency of some administrations to put all poor readers in a "broom closet" for some remedial work.
2. The question of grading in ability grouping.
3. The question of creative teaching -- what is it, and how is it achieved.
4. How to guarantee intake for non-readers and poor readers who are potential dropouts.
5. A specific definition of in-service training.
6. The advisability of using the same set of textbooks throughout the school.
7. The problem of providing balance in the skills taught at the first grade level.

V. New Ideas Presented Relevant to the Main Topic

1. Non-professional help might be recruited for the school library.
2. For children for whom suitable material cannot be found, taped materials followed by a check list for evaluation might be helpful.
3. The school might be divided into two units, one including low and average students, the other average and gifted students.
4. Present teaching emphasis might be reversed -- creativity could be taught first, followed by skills.
5. Social studies (with an economics approach) might be used to motivate reading.
6. A "buddy" system might be used to orient new teachers.
7. Secondary teachers might profit from a reading methods course.

8. Perhaps competency in reading and interpreting magazines and newspapers is adequate for retarded readers at the junior and senior high school levels.
9. A "mobile library" -- rolling shelves -- would bring the library to the classroom.
10. High-ability students could be used to help low-ability students, profiting both groups.

VI. Recommendations

1. That teachers of reading strive for a balanced, flexible, and continuous reading program with flexible grouping and daily evaluation of skills covered.
2. That small-group parent-teacher conferences be used as an aid to building and promoting a philosophy.
3. That the public be sold on the idea that it is less expensive to hire more teachers to prevent problems than to hire remedial teachers to correct problems which have already occurred.
4. That schools employ a resource person or reading specialist to assist teachers.
5. That teachers concentrate on developing creativity by various methods: reading orally to students and asking imaginative, non-objective questions; allowing pupils to think critically at their own level and within their own limitations; encouraging signs of creativity.
6. That a workshop similar to this one be conducted on inductive teaching.
7. That gifted students be encouraged to extend their reading skills into critical reading, making judgments, thinking, etc.
8. That SRA material be alternated with basic material.

Questions Asked Dr. Watson

1. What services can McREL offer?

ANSWER: McREL's services are currently in abeyance. In its present state of reorganization, McREL is meeting old commitments and avoiding new commitments while it establishes a major focus.

2. What is meant by the "inferiority complex" ascribed to new teachers?

ANSWER: This is probably a synonym for the feeling of inadequacy experienced by the new teacher who views the job of implementing ideas taught her as an under graduate as impossible in the light of the actual classroom situation. An in-service program can prove valuable in utilizing existing staff, such as superior teachers of reading. Dr. Watson suggested using the remedial reading teacher as a part-time "helping teacher" who would arrange with regular classroom teachers to teach certain groups during the reading period, observed by the classroom teachers.

Dr. Watson pointed out that many remedial reading programs are merely good classroom programs to handle people with whom other teachers have failed. He maintained that it is necessary to give only the hard-core reading problems to the remedial reading teacher, with the classroom teacher handling the others and using many of the materials now used in the remedial reading classes. Such a program would involve in-service training, identification of the needs of individual students. It would be a large undertaking but probably worth the effort.

3. How do we build diversified programs?

ANSWER: Teachers must look at their own classroom situation and identify specific problems with specific students. Look for specific answers, not for a panacea for all ills. Each teacher's program must be unique to that teacher. Thus, diversity is created.

4. How do we handle the low-ability non-reader?

ANSWER: Set no I.Q. or age limits in attempting to help such a case. Be realistic about goals and objectives. Set them for the individual according to his limitations. Most important, decide what reading really is for such a student and then attempt to fulfill that goal. In dealing with all reading problems, diagnosis and persistence should be accompanied by follow-up.

Speaking generally, Dr. Watson pointed out that diagnosis is a part of remedial instruction. Remedial reading programs should sometimes involve talking with parents, school nurses, etc. The teacher must invest some time in background preparation before beginning the actual teaching.

Classroom teachers must seek a big committment. They must try to have some time released before or after the school session in order to develop a program, to develop alternatives, to confront problems, to diagnose problems, to look for solutions. Not merely advisable, these activities are necessary in order to do an effective job.

SESSION III - Saturday, April 1, 1967 - A.M.

The speaker, Dr. George Spache, was introduced by Dr. Donald Cushenbery. He then spoke on "Reasoning in Reading". The text of his speech follows.

REASONING IN READING

Let's call reasoning synonymous with what we call comprehension in the classroom. This to most of us means merely understanding what we read. It's a nice simple way of defining it and perhaps will serve as an operational definition. However, before we can really utilize this commonplace definition of comprehension

as reasoning or reasoning as comprehension, I think we have to understand something about how the child understands.

For example, in the area of main ideas we have the practice of asking a variety of questions. We label these "main ideas." No test construction expert has ever been able to demonstrate that this is more than a concept or that there is any real difference in understanding of main ideas from that of details or any one of the other 75 or so skills we so glibly name. Let me illustrate: when you talk about teaching children to read for main ideas, do you mean the ability to recall or repeat the main idea? This is one measure of it. Can he tell you what happens in the paragraph? Or can he choose a good re-statement of it? This is basically the same skill by labeling, but not basically the same skill in terms of thinking. Can he recognize it when it is implied? When there is no bold, bald statement of the main idea? Can he recognize it and trace it or can he see the implications of it? If A & B adds up to C what does this mean in terms of application in situation? And finally, can he use it and relate it to other ideas? If this is so, what do I now believe? What do I now do with this main idea? Obviously, in classroom practice we must practically choose one or two kinds of questions like this to determine what we call the most important central facts or this main idea. We don't have the time to test other ways of understanding. This is the same thing that our reading test maker does.

He tries to decide what kinds of questions he will utilize and then, in order to differentiate he labels one of the questions "main ideas." He gives you another group which he calls "Measurement of Details" and he may do it in any one of the five or six ways which I have mentioned. Then he does a third one, of course, usually in terms of conclusions. Or, if he is real fancy, he may put in a few questions on the implications of the main idea, although he usually reserves this for a more mature child, under the belief that the smaller children can't read into the implications. Or, he asks a question on the author's purpose. Or, he asks a question on the organization of material. Now I could go on to enumerate 20 or 25, at least, basic kinds of questions which the test maker makes. All of these are supposed to measure reasoning. All are supposed to measure comprehension. In fact, we can carry this to ridiculous extremes. Do you remember Traxler's survey of reading tests some years ago: 28 reading tests, 29 kinds of comprehension. Every test he reviewed had a kind of measure of comprehension that nobody else had dreamed up. Are these true? Are these really measures of comprehension or are they convenient labels?

In other words, I'm suggesting that we can't define reasoning in reading and comprehension in terms of test scores or the labels that we call them or even in terms of questions you now ask commonly in your classroom practices.

Not only are the questions significant in determining the process that goes on, but so is the manner in which they are asked. For example, suppose I ask my questions after the children read the paragraph. I'm measuring one kind of reading, one kind of process, one kind of thinking. Suppose I ask my questions before the paragraph. This is an entirely different situation, gives the child quite a different set and is probably not the same measure. Suppose I ask them during the reading? Every second or third sentence, I insert the question. In some tests we carry this to an absurdity -- "On this line, if the first two sentences add up to so and so put an X in the margin." Or I may ask my question after each small segment, each paragraph of this long selection. These are all considered equivalent -- all considered measures of reasoning and comprehension.

As a matter of fact, after we have given such a test we don't know any more about comprehension or reasoning than we did in the beginning. We try to say "Mary comprehends well on the basis of this test and Johnny doesn't comprehend well," but apart from describing the way the questions were asked, when they were asked, and what their nature was, we haven't said anything about it. There are no two equivalent reading tests of comprehension on the market. No two tests from which one score can be readily translated and compared directly with that of another.

Look at it another way, when we measure comprehension, when we attempt to build a measure of comprehension, what do we do? We derive a variety of questions differing along the range by unknown amounts. We dip in here, we dip in a little farther along, then we dip in a big step farther along. Then we say that the child who answers eight of ten of these shows good comprehension, implying that we have measured all the comprehension possible or feasible. We don't ask one tenth of the possible questions which could measure all aspects of comprehension. We ask those which work out pretty well.

It's like observing children in a nursery school three minutes a day and drawing conclusions about attention span, or play habits. The same kind of procedure. You take a spoonful every once in a while and you put them all together and you make an analysis of the cupful you've got, and this represents the child's span of attention or what ever characteristic you would like to name. This is as about as artificial a measuring process as we have. As Dr. Arthur Traxler, a well-known test construction expert and director of testing programs says, "Reading is a stream going by from which we take a minute sample every once in a while and then we describe the stream." This is literally what we are doing.

Do these questions, do these procedures, do these techniques really measure comprehension? Do they measure certain kinds of

comprehension? Probably not. We once built a test of 140 questions which is about as long as anybody would want to give or certainly to take. It contained forty questions at least of three major types agreed upon by a group of experienced judges, some 40 on main ideas, 40 or more on details, 40 or more on conclusions. We found out after we had given the test there was no reason to report the three scores separately. As far as we could determine for any class group or individual, they read them all the same way; they got about the same score; they apparently did the same kind of thinking. Main ideas perhaps are a little different than reading for details or conclusions. But there was apparently no difference in the ability to draw conclusions and the ability to recall or recognize details. Every other experienced test construction specialist has reached the same opinion that you cannot label the skills and report sub-scores honestly.

We are no closer to a definition really of comprehension than we were before.

Now then, one other approach has been attempted. Take a whole group of tests, give these to a group of children and then interrelate all tests to try to find mathematically a common factor. What do we find? No matter what the labels were, no matter what the variety of tests, you come up with some three explanations or three elements. Seven or eight such studies have been done all with identical results. There is a word factor, an understanding of words. We call it a vocabulary factor or word meanings. This stands alone and is different from whatever else is in the test. The second factor involves relationships. The ability to add together and recognize the literal meaning of details distinguishes this factor. The third has been called by a variety of names probably most often called reasoning, inductive and deductive reasoning. Inductive reasoning means using an idea to progress to a new idea; deductive reasoning moves from a group of details toward a generalization or the drawing of a principle. I would like to suggest that even this is an incomplete reconstruction of the reading process from an intellectual standpoint or in terms of the intellectual processes which operate. I would suggest that in addition to this group reasoning factor we have at least five other processes only two of which we only normally employ in our testing, in our classroom practices, in our asking of questions to determine whether the child has reasoned or whether he has comprehended. Besides these I would suggest cognition, memory, deductive thinking, inductive thinking, and evaluation.

You may remember the articles by Gilbert and Donald E. P. Smith in the Reading Teacher several years ago in which these factors were mentioned. I have tried to take a few steps farther and defined comprehension in reading behaviors which neither of these gentlemen did. Cognition is the recognition of information, that is,

the literal idea of the paragraph -- what did it say, and a simple relationship between ideas perhaps an additive relationship or, at more mature levels, the implications of the paragraph. This is just a simple recognition of what the facts led up to. Memory is the retention of information such as the recall of details, the ability to recite them -- to tell what color Jane's dress was, etc. Then also the ability to summarize the paragraph, on a mature level and probably to relate these main ideas to one's own association. This reminds me of so and so; this calls into the forefront of my consciousness a similar story; I have heard this one before; etc. These two factors, these two elements of comprehension are quite familiar to us. If you think of the kinds of questions you ask at almost any level you recognize these are the common definitions of reasoning in the classroom or the definition of comprehension. Now the other factors I suggest we are neglecting: Deductive Thinking, logical creative ideas, about which you are going to hear a great deal more these days, such as being able to comprehend the implied main idea or being able to suggest new titles for this material. This all adds up to so and so; I would call it so and so; or a better name for this story would be so and so; or reacting to the implications to amplify these. If this is true, I may do so and so; if this is accurate, if this is correct, then I must logically follow certain steps.

Inductive Thinking -- drawing conclusions, reading to a point, reading to a generalization and such simple ideas as combining the ideas of a paragraph, as it were, into a main idea. Outlining the structure of a paragraph; being able to point out its rhetorical characteristics; topics; summary sentence; its amplification of details; its use of details to support a hypothesis. And to recognize the future applications.

Then there is the factor we often hear called Critical Reading or Evaluation. Why did the author write the story? To make you laugh? To make you cry? To help you enjoy it? Or to bring you information or what? A simple reflection of the basic emotion that the story creates in the reader. Or, is this story factual or opinion? Is the sentence completely fact? Is the paragraph completely fact or are parts of it opinion? Are there omissions or distortions or has he used deliberate tricks to distract my thinking -- to influence my thinking, such as giving a series of facts and leaving out an important element; such as distorting the facts, presenting them from his viewpoint rather than as they actually are. And the propaganda techniques. When I speak of propaganda techniques and this kind of thinking we can also begin this at the elementary levels. There is no research to indicate that the small child can not be taught to think in this way. He is simply not being taught.

In building the Diagnostic Reading Scales we tried to weave in a question that reflects the emotional development of the child, and got nowhere. The average child had no reaction, he had not been given a set -- he had not been taught to react in this fashion. For example, we have the story of a girl crossing the street. She got to the corner, the light was green for her and she crossed. In the middle of the block, there was a driver coming who had to slam on his brakes in order to stop for the light. We thought the little girl might be frightened. The only intelligent answer we ever got from any great majority of children when we asked "How did the little girl feel?" was "Bad". There was no identification here - there was no tendency to read into it. How did she feel when she got to the other side? You, of course, can think of a thousand words to substitute. Our smallest children are not being taught to think in this fashion. So we had to leave out such questions. If you are unhappy with my test -- this is one of the reasons.

Why do I give you a detailed outline of reasoning in this fashion? Because all the research we have in the instructional process shows that our children are trained to do the kind of thinking we demand by the kinds of questions we ask. Let me diverge here for just a minute to give you two simple stories that illustrate this rather dramatically. This man took third graders, and over a period of time taught them that while they were reading the front bank of lights in the classroom would be on. If that front bank of lights was on, they were to be asked a question when they finished whatever the material was. If the front bank of lights was not on, they would not be asked questions. It was as simple as that. If all the lights were on, you had to be prepared to answer questions. If the front lights were off when you finished, you could put the book away and turn to something else. He did this for several months and then he switched and he turned off the lights but had prepared questions and presented these to the group. A very bright third grade class reading on fourth and fifth grade levels could hardly answer a single question. Believe it or not, hardly a child had retained, had comprehended anything. They weren't supposed to. The lights were off.

Let me describe a similar experiment. This second study again included third grade classes. One was trained to read for main ideas. The questions constantly stressed were: What did this add up to? What was it all about? What was the main thought? -- in terminology appropriate to their level. Another group was trained to read for details, never asked to summarize or think about the material but merely to recite what the facts were, what the details in sequence were. After several months training with the two groups, he switched questions and what do you suppose happened? The children who read for main ideas had no de-

tails and those who read for details had no idea what the material was all about. Literally we train readers to think by the nature of the questions and the demands, the sets and the attitudes we give them. This is something we constantly forget. We want critical thinking; we want to promote evaluation and yet, this doesn't form one tenth of the kinds of questions or the basic demands we make. We'll never get these types of thinking until this is a constant demand. We make our children comprehend, we make them or teach them to be as stupid as we complain they are.

Let me give you a few practical suggestions from Mildred Letton, formerly of the University of Chicago. In one of the conference reports she outlines some five levels of materials and questions. You will see these parallel pretty well the five factors of intelligence or the five intellectual processes that I suggested. She called one the factual level, recall of recognition of facts or ideas. Second, a reorganization level summarizing, outlining, recognizing main ideas and the like. Third was the inferential level - drawing conclusions, inferences, perceiving relationships, cause-effect, time, size, etc. Fourth -- interpretive -- using figurative language, the connotations and denotations of the words and the ideas; sensory impressions and idiomatic language. We do give some attention to linguistics, don't we? Fifth - the evaluative or what she calls comparing, contrasting, making judgments, reacting critically. What I am suggesting very simply is that if we are to teach comprehension we must add to our cognition and our memory emphasis questions such as: Why did it happen? If we believe this, what will happen? Why did the author write this? How was he trying to influence us? Of course, this implies that the material is appropriate and that we have given the reader preparation for it and we have given a specific set, not a general set. As I said before, we could create an artificial situation and create only one type of comprehension -- critical or evaluative or deductive or inductive, whichever we choose, if we overemphasized that approach. What I am suggesting is broadening rather than a complete reversal and a complete change.

There are several other things which we don't do, however, which would strengthen reasoning in reading. One of these would be to make certain that this material can be integrated by the reader into his own experiences. We call it readiness. We call it visual aids. We call it classroom demonstration. Nine times out of ten we make the assumption that almost any material is readable by our children. In one of the very attractive reading series on display the author was offering poetry to children very early in the reading program. I was wondering how a Florida child would react to this poetry on the change of the seasons, which

unfortunately he doesn't see. To my own 12-year-old who hasn't ever seen it, snow is completely abstract. Again, here is an assumption for many children. The abrupt change of the seasons and all the glories it brings, etc. are supposed to be familiar to the average first grade child. Logical, but can we make this assumption? Before we make such assumptions we must either prepare the child for the concepts and ideas we hope for him to get; or, we must depend upon the material to bring these to him.

Reasoning, thinking, or comprehension implies that the reader has a clear-cut purpose, that he has a reason to read. I walk into so many classrooms and see a written program on the blackboard: Read pages so and so in that book, pages so and so in this book. This may be evidence of a high degree of efficiency, but also a very purposeless day, except for a teacher. She has all the purposes in mind; he's just going through routine. Let's face it, he opens that book to pages so and so. His purpose is to read it. What does this mean? It may mean something to him or it may not. It may mean what you thought it would mean, or it may not. I have never quite gotten used to the idea of a whole day planned so carefully. I'm not trying to suggest it's not sound but it does lead a child to a reading task without any prestructuring, without any purposeful planning. If you expect any kind of comprehension at all you have to leave that front bank of lights on. You have to have a purpose. He doesn't normally comprehend without having some intention; some reason to comprehend, in a certain fashion. We talk about this a great deal in training college and high school students to read better. We ask a question or two to lead their reading. We do it in a formal lesson in reading in the elementary grades. But many times we forget and assume that the reading process automatically brings cognition or memory and something of the sort because we have read something. This does not necessarily follow.

Third, if we do prestructure, if we do give only a single question or only a single comment, we give a reason for this reading. Logically then, the post-reading questions are intended to see whether this has happened. I can show you dozens of workbooks that are not this consistent. You're told to read the story carefully and then the questions are on the general implications. In other words, we often defeat our purpose by not helping him relate his purpose to the way in which he reads the material. Is it any reason, any wonder, that those of us that work with a great number of college students still find that they are really untrained readers? Our biggest problem with the college or high school student is that he handles most of his reading materials in exactly the same fashion. He reads a textbook no faster than he reads comic books. He reads a comic book no faster than he reads a physics text, many times. He's just reading, following that plan on the board. He just reads. Our biggest problem with these people is not reading skill or basic

skills for many of them, but just flexibility; to recognize that each piece of material demands something different: a different approach, more superficiality or more care or something of the sort. And this is a very difficult thing to teach this late.

Now as I said before, if we make a mathematical analysis of reasoning or comprehension in reading we have this word factor, and this again raises questions as far as procedures are concerned. What do you do about vocabulary? If this is one of the three most important elements of reading, what do you do about word meanings? This means that there must be constant attention to word meanings. Not in the fashion in so many manuals, where you write all the new words on the board and coach your children in them. Then when they come to the book, the word attack skills you presumably have taught them don't have to be used. I don't think it makes sense to pre-coach children at any level. I think it does make sense to let him make the first try. You are teaching him word attack skills; you certainly are, no matter what the critics may say. Every American reading system in the country teaches word attack skills. Differently perhaps, and in different sequence, but they are there. But we honestly don't believe we have done a job because in our practice we don't give pupils a chance to do it by themselves. We are afraid they will make a mistake. Even Dolch violently objected to this suggestion, for if the child makes a mistake, this is bad. Do you think a child learns by one mistake or one correct answer? He learns and relearns literally hundreds of times before the word becomes part of his vocabulary. And the fact that he works it out wrongly the first time, or mispronounces it or misses a syllable is not important. More than any other skill, the habit of attacking new words in some way or other is lacking among poor readers. No matter what their age is, that is their handicap. We find in our college population of poor readers youngsters who have some way or other come to this point and don't know a single sound from another or any way of finding out except by the dictionary. Each and every time these pupils meet a new word, they are stumped. We must replace this frustration with adequate opportunity and practice in trying their word attack skills, if we are to promote growth in comprehension or reasoning.

I. Main Points Discussed

A. Teaching of Reading

1. The most common fault of teachers -- bypassing adequate preparation, which may require several days.
2. Teaching according to a schedule.
3. The importance of preparing children for reading.
4. The need for teachers to develop their own reasoning power.
5. The academic "crippling" of children as a by-product of inadequate teaching.

6. The importance of readying pupils for a question.
7. The necessity of diagnosis as an aid for teachers.
8. The possible effects of Dr. Spache's ideas on classroom procedure.
9. The effect on teacher training of Dr. Spache's premises.
10. The most effective methods of evaluating teaching of comprehension skills.
11. The influence on a teacher's judgment of her knowledge of her students.
12. The degree to which all children should be expected to answer the same questions.
13. Possible ways of triggering the challenge in reasoning to children.

B. Comprehension

1. The possibility of using the SQ 3R plan to start fourth grade comprehension skills.
2. The necessity to the beginning of comprehension of experience, structuring of expectations, preoutlining.
3. The importance of avoiding overemphasis on vocabulary for the whole group.
4. Cognition and reasoning.
5. The main components of comprehension.
6. The question of word attack skills versus comprehension.
7. The distinction between comprehension and "word calling."
8. The necessity of oral language to understanding.

C. Texts and Manuals

1. The basal reading series.
2. Types of questions used in manuals.
3. The tendency of basal reading material to be aimed at city children.
4. The degree to which teachers should rely on a manual.
5. Basic texts and SRA labs.

D. Testing

1. The importance of tests.
2. Kinds of tests.
3. The tendency of tests to have an outdated vocabulary.
4. The validity of comprehension tests.

E. Special Techniques

1. The use of programmed and controlled reading in the classroom.
2. Word attack skills versus vocabulary presentation.
3. Early reading -- 2 to 3 years.
4. Validity of cumulative records.

II. Main Questions Asked

1. Are we neglecting the teaching of comprehension skills such as deductive reasoning?
2. How can we do justice to the concept of content areas such as history, which should be started before the fourth grade?
3. How can we teach deductive reading?
4. Can reading skills be taught adequately through stories and novels alone, or will this merely kill enjoyment of reading?
5. When should we begin to teach reasoning in reading?
6. Does Dr. Spache feel that basal readers will satisfy the requirements of teaching reasoning skills?
7. What is meant by the statement that comprehension does not occur naturally?
8. Why is the introduction of new vocabulary not recommended as a step to the development of comprehension, when it is a basic step in basal readers?
9. Are the components of comprehension valid at all levels?
10. How can we handle the child who reads more slowly than he thinks and the one who thinks more slowly than he perceives?
11. How can we prevent the formation of set patterns in children's comprehension?
12. How can the teacher decide when each skill should be taught to each child?
13. How can a child progress in an SRA lab?
14. Can reading labs be used to teach reading skills?
15. How can grouping be conducted if comprehension scores are not reliable guides?
16. What cumulative effect might conditioning children before reading have?
17. What criteria other than cumulative records are available for evaluating comprehension?
18. In a class of 32, how can the teacher organize in order to teach each child by the method most likely to make him learn?
19. How can a teacher unfamiliar with ITA, instruct a new student who has had instruction in ITA? (Answer: This has not proved to be a problem where such a situation has arisen. Some individual instruction was necessary but reading materials are available in both areas and the transition usually goes smoothly.)

20. What series of reading textbooks is adequate?
21. How can we be sure that a child has a visual image when we ask an inference question?
22. Should the teacher supplement the questions in the manual with questions offering more variety?
23. Is it ever effective to ask questions before a reading session?
24. How can we evaluate our method of asking questions in order to improve teaching?
25. What kinds of questions stimulate critical thinking?
26. Is it not possible that questioning before a story might ruin the plot?
27. Can we class as a remedial case a child whose instruction has been inadequate?
28. What tests are being used to select students for the remedial reading program?
29. What grading basis should be used for reading?
30. Are our grading standards sufficiently inclusive?
31. How much credence should be placed in I.Q.'s, and how can they be related to reading ability?
32. Was Dr. Spache's statement about schedules meant to imply that a written schedule prevents children from learning to think? (Answer: ...a schedule is needed because of the number of structured specials, such as T.V. lessons, supervisors, etc.)
33. How would Dr. Spache change existing classroom procedures?
34. Do teachers usually teach the way they were taught, or the way they were taught to teach?
35. Is the learning process as fragmented as we are led to believe?
36. Should the teacher examine the child's records before seeing the child?
37. How can teachers be persuaded to avoid stereotyped methods and be more creative?

III. Pertinent Points Resolved

1. Too much of education is mere conformity, obedience to commands. More opportunity for independent thinking and creative work is needed in the classroom.
2. Flexibly guided discussions may help to encourage independent thinking.
3. Children should learn to relate their own experiences to what they read.
4. Too many decisions about children are based solely on test results.
5. Grading tends to become the master rather than the servant of education. Evaluation of grading systems and habits is necessary.
6. Skills should be taught as they are needed (Library Group).
7. Skills should be taught as they are presented in the manual. (Group 124)

8. Basal readers provide background for teaching skills. They should be supplemented as necessary by the individual teacher.
9. The weakness of the questions in most manuals makes it necessary for teachers to formulate their own questions.
10. Children should learn independent use of word skills; one way to achieve this is by their working out their own words in context.
11. Reading is a cognitive process which occurs developmentally and is preceded by thinking.
12. Motivation is basic in learning to read. The teacher alone cannot be held responsible for failure to stimulate children. Other factors, such as homelife, must be considered.
13. Oral reading should be used chiefly as a diagnostic tool.
14. The components of comprehension should be developed in the early grades, and continuously reinforced.
15. The teacher should condition children for each type of reading.
16. Children must be helped to develop self-confidence.
17. Administrative commendation of flexibility in teaching may serve as inspiration to other teachers.

IV. Pertinent Points Not Resolved

1. How to teach the "comprehension strands" that go beyond facts and main ideas.
2. How to resolve the dilemma of children who must miss study time on regular classroom assignments in order to attend remedial reading classes.
3. How to impress on teachers the necessity of teaching children to think.
4. How to encourage teachers to depend less on manuals.
5. How to overcome teacher-pupil personality problems.
6. How to resolve the dilemma of children who have been diagnosed as reading below their grade level, but who are forced to read at their grade level in subjects such as Social Studies and Science.

V. New Ideas Presented Relevant to the Main Topic

1. A separate sheet for each child, recording his problem areas and making it possible to group children with similar needs.
2. The subjective measurement of concentration by facial expressions, absorption in reading, obliviousness to surroundings, etc.
3. The use of tape recorders and pacers to improve concentration.
4. Use of the title "Speed Reading" for the reading program in order to stimulate interest.

5. An explanation of the Extended Day Reading Program used in Anti-Poverty Areas.
6. Recorded "mood music" to establish an atmosphere and prepare a group to concentrate.
7. The use of the Margaret Dornen Diagnostic Test from the third grade as an aid to teaching phonics.
8. The Singer Literature Texts as aids to reasoning and critical thinking.

Mrs. Clara Spencer of Gibbon described her approach to remedial reading. Her remedial reading class performs a course of exercises designed to improve their overall coordination. Beginning with hand-eye exercises involving drawing diverging circles with both hands while concentrating on a spot at eye level, they progress to highly refined crawling, balancing exercises. Hand exercises for fine motor coordination and eye exercises for direction are included. Based on the pamphlet, "Unlocking the Secrets of the Brain," published by Delcotto and Dolman, the exercises have proved very effective in advancing the reading level of the third graders in Mrs. Spencer's former class and are proving very effective in her current teaching of remedial reading.

VI. Recommendations

1. That future workshops be preceded by mailing of programs and thought-provoking questions to participants. It is felt that the time, effort, and money involved in such an undertaking would be justified by the increased participation and understanding made possible.
2. That future workshops allow more time for panel discussion and distillation groups.
3. That grade-level area meetings be organized.
4. That more opportunities be provided for educating teachers in the newer approaches to reading--workshops, in-service programs. The cooperation of administrators would be necessary to effective use of such programs.

Questions Asked Dr. Spache

1. How can a teacher encourage critical thinking?

ANSWER: The teacher must lead, needle, argue and push students to think from the first grade. Recall is not the important thing; thinking is. Children should learn to consider, to have opinions about what they read -- about its credibility, impact, etc. Question patterns must vary in order to help the child become involved in what he reads. Deal with ideas rather than with words. Teaching critical reading involves stimulation at all ages and all levels. Reading is an interpretive, emotional, acting thing.

2. Why should we clarify only the "unfamiliar technical vocabulary" before a reading lesson?

ANSWER: Let the student attack by himself all but the most technical words. Use the word attack skills you have been teaching; have confidence in your teaching. Miscalling words is common everywhere, and much of it may have been caused by over-concentration on vocabulary before the reading of a selection. Clarification comes from context, not from pre-teaching individual words.

3. How can we evaluate a child's development in comprehension?

ANSWER: Use a variety of materials. Consider the evidence of his progress in using resource materials, his recognition of the different purposes and different types of reading -- for retention or recreation. Try to evaluate his flexibility, intelligence and criticality, all parts of comprehension. Above all, does he read voluntarily; does he enjoy reading?

4. What are the kinds of comprehension?

ANSWER: These are labels given by test-makers and do not exist in practice. The kinds of comprehension really mean the purposes of reading -- what are we reading for? The differences lie in the methods people use to achieve their reading goals -- in the set they adopt toward reading.

5. What criteria should we use for readiness?

ANSWER: The teacher should be able to tell through her knowledge of the child whether or not he is ready for reading and what problems he has or is likely to have. Base the decision on your judgment and then use tests to confirm your judgment. Do not, however, base the decision on results of tests. When testing a class of children for reading readiness, it is wise to administer the tests several times with different groups of children as they seem to be ready rather than to try to administer the same test at the same time to the whole class.

More attention to reading readiness could probably eliminate many reading problems before they start. Many cases brought to reading clinics have been started too early, before they were ready.

SESSION IV, Saturday, April 1, 1967 - P.M.

The final speaker was Dr. Dorothy Kendall Bracken who treated the methods controversy.

THE CONTROVERSY CONCERNING METHODS OF TEACHING READING

1. Historical Methods of Teaching Reading

During the 1800's reading was taught by the alphabet method, which was really more of a spelling method than a reading method. It produced extremely effective spellers and quite ineffective readers. In fact, if pupils were taught by an alphabet method they would not be prepared to cope with reading assignments at the high school level - to say nothing of those on a university campus! When a person taught by the alphabet method came to a word he didn't know, he spelled it out, calling each letter by its name. If he knew the word the letters spelled, he had solved his problem. If he didn't know the word the letters spelled, he still hadn't unlocked the unknown word.

In the late 1800's the phonics method became the popular method by which reading was taught. This was a step in the right direction. Certainly sounding the letters in a word was a better word attack method than spelling the letters. There were two characertistics of the historical phonics method: (1) each letter was sounded separately, and (2) there was no attempt at blending. The best approaches to teaching by a modern phonics method remedies both these defects.

At the turn of the century, the sight method came into being as the result of the research and experimentation by Cattell and others with the tachistoscope method. Catell had proven that with one look or fixation, at very short intervals (even 1/100 of a second) a person can see in a set position* not only a single letter at a time, but also a whole word or words in phrases.

The right method then, as a beginning method of teaching reading is based on research. Most reading experts believe it is desirable in the initial stage of reading to build up a sight vocabulary with boys and girls. Since first grade teachers have the additional responsibility to teach children that black marks on white paper can have meaning in their lives, the experience chart

---

*This should not be interpreted to mean that in the reading act, which is mobile and not a set position, that a person can see very many words per fixation. In fact, research conducted by George Spache and results reported by him indicate that in general we fix on almost every word but we process thought by phrases. (Spache, The Reading Teacher, "Is This A Breakthrough in Reading?" Our discussion here is concerned with a method of learning in the initial stages of the reading process and not directly concerned with fixations or improving rate of reading.

has proven a desirable tool in beginning reading. Too, some children come to school not having seen an adult get enjoyment or information from reading. Among other things, first grade teachers sometimes take walks around the school with the children in order to have a common experience with the group; from the common experience between teachers and students such oral language phrases, and words then help to build the child's right vocabulary.

Historically, then, our basic methods came into being chronologically in this order: alphabet, phonic, sight.

II. Emphasis on Various Methods in the Modern Elementary Curriculum

Today the way in which the various methods are emphasized in the curriculum is the opposite from the chronological way in which these methods came into being. The sight method was the last method to evolve, but it is emphasized at the beginning of the curriculum. The phonics method was the second one to be used, historically, and the second to be emphasized today. The alphabet method (spelling and writing) was in operation a hundred years ago, but the method which is emphasized last in the modern reading curriculum.

The sight method is emphasized first, the phonetic method and alphabet method are carried on at the same time. No good teacher ever uses one of these methods exclusive of the others. As a result of the widespread use of the sight method, the majority of children are able to learn an initial sight vocabulary rather quickly. From 1913 forward almost all first grade teachers employed the sight method of teaching reading in the initial stage reading instruction.

The sight method incorporated the sentence, phrase, word method and is sometimes popularly known as the "look-say" method. We've never found a better way to get a large majority of children quickly pushed off into reading. Although the lay public has criticized this method, the majority of reading experts endorse the sight method as the beginning method for classroom use. Each teacher, not just the first grade teacher, has the responsibility to build the children's sight vocabulary at whatever level he happens to work. If we only used the sight method however, our children would be weak readers. Each method - the alphabet method, the phonics method, the sight method - has a fallacy within it. By using a <u>combination</u> of methods, each succeeding method takes care of the weaknesses of the preceding method. We reinforce the sight method with the phonic method; we reinforce the phonic method with the alphabet method (spelling and writing).

Another method, developed in the thirties by Grace Fernald, is the kinesthetic or tactile method. For many years this method has been used by remedial teachers and clinicians. Some children

2. Grouping for instruction in phonics.
3. Ways of introducing vocabulary.
4. The kinesthetic approach, to provide tactile experiences; this could include manipulatory devices.
5. The CSSD word attack.
6. The ITA
7. The sight method.
8. Word patterns.
9. The relative merits of the three methods of teaching reading.
10. Critical thinking.
11. Various systems for teaching phonics.
12. The question of teaching the use of the dictionary.
13. Teaching the word attack skills.
14. The possibility that the child's situation should determine the advisability of introducing the study of vocabulary.
15. The use of non-graded materials in the primary grades.
16. The danger of spending too much time on diagnosis and not enough on curing.
17. The use of different texts for different groups in the same classroom.

B. Evaluation

1. The difficulty of using questions alone for evaluation.
2. Tests and their reliability.
3. The overemphasis on tests.

C. Problems

1. The tendency to overemphasize "phonics."
2. Student attitudes.
3. The problem of obtaining cooperation from principals and other teachers.
4. Methods of grouping.
5. The limitations of ITA transfer.

II. Main Questions Asked

1. How can we convince teachers, the administration, and the public that children need to progress at their own rates?
2. Would a state-adopted, statewide reading text be advisable?
3. What is involved in grouping by different methods?
4. If tests are reliable, what criteria can we use for grade placement and grouping? How much reliance should be placed in teacher judgment?

5. How can we diagnose a child's needs when the fact of his reading difficulty has been established?
6. How may structural linguistics be utilized as an approach to reading?
7. Are the reading tests in the basic readers really too difficult, or are the questions asked before the child is ready?
8. Should a child who is still working in the primer be kept in first grade or is this likely to destroy his confidence?
9. Should children be held back in kindergarten?
10. Does Dr. Bracken agree with Dr. Durell's statement that a supplementary phonics program should be instituted along with the basal programs?
11. Why are basic ideas rather than words not related in spelling?
12. How much reinforcement in skills is necessary?

II. Pertinent Points Resolved

1. Lack of sufficient time and the unwieldy size of classes contribute heavily to reading difficulties.
2. The child must learn to appreciate the value of his own thinking and viewpoints.
3. Any system, used with care and enthusiasm, will work. (Group 131)
4. No one method can be isolated and unconditionally recommended. A combination of the three is more likely to be useful.
5. A statewide text would be a hindrance rather than a help. (Group 241)
6. The average child cannot retain enough sight vocabulary for successful reading.
7. Vowels can be taught first. (Group 126)
8. Vowels should be left until the end of the first grade. (Group 242)
9. A combination of methods in grouping would help to ensure that no child would be cheated.
10. The speakers tended to overemphasize grouping in order to make their points. (Group 127)
11. Manuals accompanying basic readers should be used since they have been prepared with much care and research.
12. The Reading Reform Foundation should be avoided. It lacks research or a good basis for its program. (Group 129)
13. Children should be taught how to use the dictionary and diacritical marks.
14. Children should learn to use context to supplement the building of skills.
15. Levels of ability must be considered in teaching phonics.
16. Word attack should follow context attack.

IV. Pertinent Points Not Resolved

1. How to find time for individual reports on students' errors.
2. How best to utilize available time.
3. How much reliance to place on testing, teacher judgment, and children's wishes and interests.
4. Whether or not to act as missionaries in passing on to fellow workers knowledge and ideas gained at this workshop.
5. The possibility of teaching all five components of reasoning with one selection.

V. New Ideas Presented Relevant to the Main Topic

1. Phonics we use is one of the most thorough sources on word attack skills.
2. The linguistic approach tends to neglect the meaning of a word in favor of its pronunciation and construction.
3. Unknown words can be marked and attacked individually.
4. Spot checks and help provided where needed might save more extensive remedial work later.
5. Tests in previously used basic readers might be used as guides to determine the child's skills for grouping in special work.
6. The Dolch Word Lists may be used as a move toward putting words in a context situation.

VI. Recommendations

1. That more reading workshops like this one be held.
2. That shorter and more frequent workshops be held in different parts of the state.
3. That boards of education and other administrative bodies be convinced of the value of such workshops and of the value of encouraging teachers to attend.
4. That more administrators attend such workshops.
5. That future workshops allow more time for discussion groups.
6. That future workshops divide distillation groups according to levels of teaching.
7. That in future workshops the room and group assignments be changed after the first day.

Questions Asked Dr. Bracken

1. Should reading be taught in kindergarten?

ANSWER: Certainly, if the children are ready to read. Individual readiness is vital; and, therefore, great caution must be exercised in teaching reading at lower levels.

2. How much importance should we attach to teaching the diacritical marks in the dictionary?

ANSWER: The diacritical marks are necessary to effective use of the dictionary. However, we could save ourselves much time and trouble by working only with those in stressed syllables since the reasons for not stressing syllables are not known even to language specialists and not important to children learning to read.

3. What is an effective basis for grouping?

ANSWER: The usual basis for grouping for reading instruction is the reading level, as established by tests. This is probably the most satisfactory basis; however, it would undoubtedly be stronger combined with the way and speed with which children learn. We cannot avoid the problem of individual differences in even the smallest, most select groups. We must, therefore, continue to work with individuals and groups.

4. Should we pass or fail the child who is below his grade level in reading?

ANSWER: It would be an improvement if we were to eliminate "grades" in all subjects, but especially in reading. Probably one reason for the success of reading clinics with problem readers is the lack of grade levels. Children are "individuals," not "graders." Our philosophy of social promotion breaks down with the rigidly one-grade-oriented teacher who has in fact, a roomful of assorted grade levels with which to deal.

DISCUSSION AND SUMMARY

There seems to be no doubt that the workshop was an unqualified success. The comments on the recorder's worksheets indicate a high level of satisfaction among the participants and a strong desire to attend more such workshops in the future. The criticisms were constructive and were mostly directed at nonparticipants rather than at those attending and those organizing the workshop.

Several areas are revealed as of special concern to most teachers of reading. These topics appear again and again in the lists of points discussed and questions asked:

1. Grouping: Teachers are anxious to know how to handle grouping of their students for reading instruction. Specifically, they are in a quandary as to what criteria to use for establishing the groups.

2. Evaluation: The question of testing and evaluation recurs frequently. The limitations of most tests are clearly seen by teachers, who do not trust test results, but do not know what to use as a substitute.

3. Time: Many teachers mentioned the difficulty of making time for the myriad activities required of classroom teachers. They deplore the lack of time for the individual instruction and attention that their pupils need. The pressure of extracurricular activities was mentioned by some teachers; others inquired about the usefulness of teaching aides to relieve some of the routine pressures on teachers.

4. Staff and Administration Cooperation: It is of paramount importance to the teacher of reading, whether regular or remedial classes, that the rest of the staff and the administration understand the nature and importance of her work and give their cooperation. The excellent point was made that remedial reading classes frequently become depositories for the "unteachables" and "deviates" of the school. This is due to a lack of understanding on the part of the powers-that-be, and most regrettable.

5. Basic Reading Texts: Although many basal reading series are available, there is considerable confusion as to their relative merits and possible uses. Teachers want to know which

series to recommend and which ones to avoid. They are interested in the special uses and purposes of specific books.

Although other questions were asked and other points discussed, these five seem to be the most important and the most vexing to reading teachers.

APPENDIX A

Teaching Aids Suggested and Discussed in the Distillation Groups

I. Basal Readers

1. The McKee-Harrison Series, published by Houghton-Mifflin --uses pictures to teach vocabulary.
2. Wide-Horizons, published by Harper-Row.
3. The New Linguistic Series, grades I-VI.
4. The Singer Literature Texts.

II. Tests

1. The Basic Reader Mastery Test
2. The Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test
3. The Margaret Dornen Diagnostic Test -- Good for phonics, from third grade.

III. Teaching Aids

1. The Initial Teaching Alphabet
2. The Dolch Word List (See Teaching Primary Reading, p. 255)
3. The Continental Press materials -- visual for discrimination and motor skills; auditory for blending and rhyming.
4. Reading Aids Through the Grades, Russell and Russell.
5. Chalk Board Exercise for Hand and Eye Skills in Visual Discrimination, used at the University of Florida Reading Clinic.
6. Summary of Individual Differences, used at the University of Florida Reading Clinic.
7. Phonics in a Nutshell -- A series of records and filmstrips.
8. Phonics We Use -- Useful in teaching word attack skills.
9. IRA Films -- Ira Headquarters
   Box 695
   Newark, Delaware
10. The CSSD Formula -- Context, sound, structure, and dictionary.
11. The Craig Reader - teaching machines.
12. The SRA Programmed Reading Laboratories Science Research Associates.
13. The Spache Readibility Formula -- Available through the University of Florida Reading Clinic.
14. The Dale and Chall Readability Formula.
15. The Morton-Botell Readability Formula.

IV. Instructional Materials Centers

1. The Learning Resource Center at Red Oak, Iowa

   a. Covers seven-county area.
   b. Federally financed.
   c. Has a direct line to schools.
   d. Teachers may order materials every day and receive them the same day.
   e. Teachers may keep materials as long as needed, within reason.
   f. The materials include films, tapes, transparencies.
   g. A planetarium is available.

2 The Multi-Grade School Instructional Center of Lancaster County

   a. The Assistant Superintendent has volunteered to deliver and pick up materials requested.
   b. Materials include books, filmstrips, tapes.
   c. Materials may be combined for unit work.

3. Crestridge School Library of Omaha

   a. Federally financed.
   b. Materials include listening stations, filmstrips, overhead projectors.
   c. Librarians and aides are available.
   d. The library provides an ideal set-up.

Note: We regret the incompleteness of these listings. Unfortunately, the teachers who suggested the various resources sometimes neglected to give additional information as to availability, publisher, source of supply. Where possible, we have given such information. This list is intended as a suggestion, and not as an authoratative guide.

APPENDIX B

READING WORKSHOP

March 31, 1967 - April 1, 1967

MAXINE M. ABRAMS
STAPLETON, NEBR. 69163

BARBARA AHLSCHWEDE
MALCOLM, NEBR. 68402

MRS. MADELINE AHLSCHWEDE
BOX 78
MALCOLM, NEBR.

B. B. AKERT
1800 SO 51
LINCOLN, NEBR. 68506

MRS. NYLA ALEXANDER
PLAINVIEW
NEBRASKA

MAXINE ALLARD
VALENTINE PUBLIC SCHOOLS
VALENTINE, NEBR.

LAVERNA AMANN
CULBERTSON, NEBR.

ALMA ASHLEY
PERU STATE COLLEGE
PERU, NEBR.

EVALEE ATKINS
6947 W ST.
LINCOLN, NEBR.

MRS. CATHARINE BAHNSEN
16 EAST 27TH ST.
KEARNEY, NEBR. 68847

ELIZABETH BEALL
ROCA, NEBR. 68430

PAT BECKENHAUER
AINSWORTH, NEBR.

ELEANOR M. BECKER
4209 ST. PAUL
LINCOLN, NEBR.

CLARA BEEZLEY
516 N HASTINGS
HASTINGS, NEBR.

MRS. FRED BEILE
470 EASTRIDGE
CRETE, NEBR. 68333

MRS. HELEN BELOHRAD
CLARKSON, NEBR. 68629

DOROTHY L. BENDER
BOX 3
MILFORD, NEBR.

BENEDICTINE SISTERS
ST. JOSEPH'S SCHOOL
ATKINSON, NEBR.

FERN BERNHAGEN
ELKHORN, NEBR.

RUTH N. BINDY
2009 WEST 6TH ST.
HASTINGS, NEBR. 68901

MRS. WM. BISBEE
ARLINGTON, NEBR.

MRS. CELIA BLANK
4819 FARNAM
OMAHA, NEBR.

GEORGE BLEICH
904 1/2 MCLAUGHLIN CIRCLE
BELLEVUE, NEBR.

GEORGE BLOCHER
KEARNEY STATE COLLEGE
KEARNEY, NEBR.

LOUISE BLOMENKAMP
700 SO. 55
LINCOLN, NEBR.

MRS. ILA BOETTCHER
630 NORTH 48
LINCOLN, NEBR.

ALBIN S. BOSN
6251 NEBRASKA AVE.
OMAHA, NEBR.

JAMES H. BOTHE
1311 NO. 70 AVE.
OMAHA, NEBR.

MILDRED BOYD
2229 NO. 39 ST.
OMAHA, NEBR.

MRS. ROY BRAND
1103 SHERMAN
HOLDREGE, NEBR. 68949

MRS. GLORIA BRECKENRIDGE
TEKAMAH, NEBR.

LESSIE BREHM
SYRACUSE, NEBR.

LEOTA BREITFELDER
5910 GILLAN RD.
LINCOLN, NEBR.

DR. BARBARA BRILHART
9803 PASADENA
OMAHA, NEBR.

MADGE BROADY
JOHNSON, NEBR.

VIRGINIA BRYG
4950 FRANCES ST.
OMAHA, NEBR.

MRS. JEAN BUCK
3218 10TH AVE.
KEARNEY, NEBR.

MRS. NORMA BURKE
BURWELL, NEBR.

MARY JANE BURNEY
DEWITT, NEBR.

JOHN H. CAIN
4006 N. 43 ST.
OMAHA, NEBR.

MARGUERITTE J. CALDWELL
1109 LANCASTER LANE
LINCOLN, NEBR.

MRS. BONNIE CAMPBELL
1010 PARKWAY DR.
BELLEVUE, NEBR. 68005

JANET CARSON
5310 WILSHIRE BLVD.
LINCOLN, NEBR.

MRS. DORCAS CAVETT
1835 HIGH
LINCOLN, NEBR.

KAREN CAVINESS
5111 PIONEER BLVD.
LINCOLN, NEBR.

HELEN CHELEWSKI
STAPLETON, NEBR.

WINNIFRED CHILDERS
UTICA, NEBR.

MRS. VERGIE CHUDOMELKA
SCRIBNER, NEBR.

MAE T. CLARK
CLARK HOTEL
HASTINGS, NEBR.

NETTIE M. CLARK
2642 NO. 59
LINCOLN, NEBR.

learn best by this method. Another important volume on the history of methods of teaching reading is Nels Barton Smith's American Reading Instruction, published by the International Reading Association.

III. The Controversy over Phonics

If reading methods in general are in controversy, certainly the phonics method is also. Sometimes lost in discussions of phonics versus no phonics or much phonics versus a little phonics is the fact that it is imperative to find out who can profit from instruction in phonics. Some children can and some can not. Some children have auditory discrimination and some do not.

In dealing with phonics it is extremely important that we separate in our minds methods and systems. A system is an arrangement of sounds that some one person thought would be an appropriate one in dealing with the English language. A system is usually characterized by a breakdown when the children reach the intermediate grades and meet polysyllabic and ultrasyllabic words. The trick in teaching phonics is to teach items of sound during the primary years which will hold in the intermediate grades. The approach of teaching patterns of phonics is considered a way of simplifying phonic instruction for pupils. If a child is taught according to patterns, he will respond to appropriate groups of letters. Each needs to be taught phonics as well as the other word attack skills. The trend is to simplify phonic teaching, not to teach 300 "bits and pieces" about our language as some "systems" attempt. The best teachers follow known research and practical experience which indicates the teaching of phonic particles and fewer particles.

Two important studies are:

1. Theodore Clymer's "Utilization of Phonetic Analysis." (Reading Teacher, January 1963, p. 252) Some of the phonic elements we teach are only operative a small per cent of the time in our language.

2. Fred Davis' "The Phonic Method Versus the Combination Method in Teaching Beginning Reading" (Content, structure, phonics. Twelfth Yearbook of the National Reading Conference New Developments in Programs and Procedures, p. 171). Dr. Davis' study showed that even in a phonic language, the combination method was as successful, or slightly more so, than the phonic method. Perhaps before choosing a phonics program consideration should be given to criteria for judging its worth. Educators might wish to answer these questions:

1. What elements are taught first? Most reading experts think consonants should be taught first, since the initial vocabulary has a large number of words beginning with consonants. If vowels are taught first in the initial stages of reading care should be exercised to establish left-right directional pattern. Children may develop a detrimental eye movement habit of looking first at the center part of the words.

2. How much practice on blending is provided?

3. How many phonic "particles" are presented in the first grade? Hundreds of "particles" are taught in the first grade by some "systems." If such a program operates, the teacher then has no time or opportunity to develop skills of comprehension, interpretation and application.

We fail if we think we can postpone the teaching of initial steps in evaluation at the seventh grade level. One of the prime problems of adult reading is evaluative, critical reading. Every skill refined and expanded on the secondary level must be begun in the first grade. If all the first grade teacher's time is taken up in drilling and sounding out words no time remains to guide children toward better comprehension, interpretation, evaluation and application of ideas to their own living. The aim should be to teach reading so well that pupils will read the best materials available and as a result of their reading, be entirely different people than they otherwise might have been.

Often in education we ask ourselves the wrong questions. One wrong question is, "By what method should we teach reading?" In contrast to that, perhaps the right question is, "By what method does <u>this child learn best</u>?" Teachers must find out the method by which every child learns best: sight, phonetic, kinesthetic, or combination.

Dr. Robert Mills (Mills Reading Center, Ft. Lauderdale, Florida) has developed a Learning Methods Test which yields this information.

Individuals differ in many ways some of which we have studied during the past years. In most classrooms more attention should be given to meeting individual differences in the area of the <u>method</u> by which each child learns best.

C. <u>Main Points Discussed</u>

A. <u>Teaching of Reading</u>

1. The advisability of teaching a procedure as a psychological, confidence-building step, rather than teaching a system.

PATRICA CLARK
2001 5TH AVE.
SCOTTSBLUFF, NEBR.

MRS. MARIE CLARKE
2735 NO. 45 AVE.
OMAHA, NEBR.

SISTER CLEOPHA
807 F ST.
FAIRBURY, NEBR.

FRANCES CLOYED
SYRACUSE, NEBR.

PAULINE COCHELL
1926 SOUTH 22
LINCOLN, NEBR.

NORMA COCHRAN
FREMONT, NEBR.
(Midland College)

PAULINE COLLIER
508 No. ST. JOSEPH
HASTINGS, NEBR.

GAY COLSON
3101 WASHINGTON #A
BELLEVUE, NEBR. 68005

MRS. LOIS COMSTOCK
207 ORCHARD DRIVE
BELLEVUE, NEBR. 68005

GERALD CONIGLIO
5443 FONTENELL BLVD.
OMAHA, NEBRASKA

RICHARD CONNOLE
SYRACUSE, NEBR.

ADELE COPENHAVER
327 7TH ST.
SYRACUSE, NEBR.

PHYLLIS M. COTTON
2911 WASHINGTON, APT. 79
BELLEVUE, NEBR. 68005

CURTIS CRANDALL
2772 STAR LANE
COLUMBUS, NEBR.

DONNA E. CRAWFORD
106 E. 30TH
KEARNEY, NEBR.

SAMUEL CRAWFORD
4127 MAPLE
OMAHA, NEBR.

MRS. DARLENE CULP
717 B ST.
FAIRBURY, NEBR.

ELLEN CURRAN
526 SO SECOND
ALBION, NEBR.

MIKE CURRIER
5905 FOWLER
OMAHA, NEBR. 68104

EARL G. CURTIS
601 ADAMS
KIMBALL, NEBR.

DR. DONALD C. CUSHENBERY
UNIVERSITY OF OMAHA
OMAHA, NEBR. 68101

ERMA DALEY
MERNA, NEBR.

NADINE DANIELSON
614 N. 10TH ST.
PLATTSMOUTH, NEBR.

EVELYN DARLING
1011 N 49 ST.
OMAHA, NEBR. 68132

SR. MARY HUGH DAVID
611 BROADVIEW DRIVE
LINCOLN, NEBR.

HAROLD B. DAVIS
3104 9TH AVE.
KEARNEY, NEBR. 68847

SR. DAVID MARIE DEBOCK
100 N. 62ND ST.
OMAHA, NEBR. 68130

MRS. MARJORIE DECKER
TILDEN, NEBR.

MRS. MARGARET DE RYKE
HARTINGTON, NEBR.

SUSANNE DISCOE
PAXTON, NEBR.

MARY DODSON
TRI COUNTY SCHOOL
DEWITT, NEBR.

JUDY DONDLINGER
SHICKLEY, NEBR.

GERANE DREWES
PLYMOUTH, NEBR.

MRS. MARTIN DUNKLAU
1332 SOUTH 96 ST.
OMAHA, NEBR.

LILLIAN EDDY
2301 O ST.
AUBURN, NEBR.

LES ELMORE
903 E. 31
KEARNEY, NEBR.

MRS. FRANCES ENEVOLDSEN
3701 SOUTH 33RD ST.
LINCOLN, NEBR.

JACK ERNST
2530 N. 63RD
LINCOLN, NEBR.

LENORE R. ETCHISON
3457 BIGGS ST.
OMAHA, NEBR. 68123

MRS. MARGARET P. EVANS
702 EAST PIERCE
COUNCIL BLUFFS, IOWA

MRS. DORIS FIELD
3052 WHITMORE
OMAHA, NEBR. 68112

MARILYN K. FINKE
2911 WASHINGTON #79
BELLEVUE, NEBR. 68005

PAULINE MARJORIE FISH
BLUE HILL, NEBR. 68930

MRS. PHYLLIS FITCH
HERMAN, NEBR.

VIRGINIA FLANAGAN
2323 VILLAGE CT.
OMAHA, NEBR.

DORIS FORREST
8734 HAMILTON ST.
OMAHA, NEBR. 68114

JOANN M. FOSNAUGH
720 COTTONWOOD DRIVE
LINCOLN, NEBR.

CHARLOTTE FOSTER
BOX 131
MILFORD, NEBR.

ELEANOR FRANCKE
24 AND VAN DORN
LINCOLN, NEBR.

JAMES W. FREEMAN
1910 BINNEY ST. #4
OMAHA, NEBR. 68110

LOIS FRITZ
5916 CAMDEN AVE.
OMAHA, NEBR.

ZOLA GARDNER
502 SOUTH 12
LINCOLN, NEBR.

JEANIE GAFNER
1535 SO. 28TH ST.
OMAHA, NEBR.

EHTELIND GARETZ
1513 N. 76 ST.
OMAHA, NEBR.

MRS. BERNICE GARRELS
DILLER, NEBR.

CONNIE D. GARRELS
DILLER, NEBR.

GORDON M. GEALY
GORDON, NEBR.

LINDA GEHRIG
8220 BLONDO ST., APT. 228
OMAHA, NEBR.

MRS. EDLA GERDES
514 SIXTH ST.
FRIEND, NEBR.

RUBY GERDES
GOTHENBURG, NEBR.

HARVEY GILBERT
5501 1/2 NO. 78 ST.
OMAHA, NEBR.

TERESA GIVENS
STUART, NEBR.

JUDITH GOOD
3333 STARR
LINCOLN, NEBR. 68503

DOROTHY GORDON
604 FRANKLIN AVE.
COUNCIL BLUFFS, IOWA

DWIGHT GRANDGENETT
11634 WESTWOOD LANE
OMAHA, NEBR. 68144

MRS. WAYNE GREEN
2224 LINCOLN AVE.
PLATTSMOUTH, NEBR. 68048

TOM GROTH
BOX 242
GORDON, NEBR.

MRS. SALLY GROVES
BOX 78
WAKEFIELD, NEBR.

MARY ALYCE GROW
BOX 37
SUTHERLAND, NEBR.

MARIANNE GUILE
5118 LEAVENWORTH
OMAHA, NEBR.

ELLA E. HAHLWEG
ROUTH 1
HASTINGS, NEBR. 68901

HARLAN R. HAILEY
1706 D
SCHUYLER, NEBR.

MRS. LUDMILA B. HAMOUZ
TOBIAS, NEBR.

BERNICE HANSEN
HARDY, NEBR.

ELNA HANSEN
CORDOVA, NEBR.

MRS. FRANCES HANSEN
FRIEND PUBLIC SCHOOL
FRIEND, NEBR.

RUBY HARMS
SYRACUSE, NEBR.

JOHANNA C. HARNAN
BOX 53
GANDY, NEBR.

MRS. JUDY HARRIS
3242 SOUTH 40th
LINCOLN, NEBR.

LUELLA M. HARRIS
4120 PRESCOTT
LINCOLN, NEBR.

IRIS HART
8217 SO. CHERRYWOOD DR.
LINCOLN, NEBR.

PAMLIN HAUSCHILD
1057 MOHAWK
SYRACUSE, NEBR.

MRS. MILDRED HASSELL
EXETER, NEBR.

MRS. LULAMAE HATHAWAY
AINSWORTH, NEBR.

MARJORIE HEGGESTAD
8308 FRANKLIN ST.
OMAHA, NEBR. 68114

HELEN HEITGERD
BOX 63
SEWARD, NEBR. 68434

VAN HENKLE
227 N. 11
LINCOLN, NEBR.

WILMA W. HENKLE
1118 LANCASTER LANE
LINCOLN, NEBR.

MAY HENNING
EXETER, NEBR.

GARY HENRICHS
1108 MAIN ST.
WAYNE, NEBR.

BARBARA A. HESKE
101 CEDAR AVE.
BELLEVUE, NEBR.

DEE R. HICKMAN
LANCASTER CO. COURT HOUSE
LINCOLN, NEBR.

MILDRED HILL
BRYANT SCHOOL
SCOTTSBLUFF, NEBR.

MARILYN HINKLE
BOX 79
BERTRAND, NEBR.

MRS. J. P. HINDS
BOX 251
ARAPAHOE, NEBR.

MRS. HELEN HINZE
RISING CITY, NEBR.

MRS. GWENDOLYN HODGES
2920 N. 24TH ST.
OMAHA, NEBR.

RUTH HOFF
3819 JONES
OMAHA, NEBR.

MARY HELEN HOGENDORN
119 N. COLFAX
WEST POINT, NEBR.

M. B. HOIDAL
411 STEELE AVE.
LINCOLN, NEBR.

MRS. DONNA HOLMES
615 N. ELM ST.
GRAND ISLAND, NEBR. 68801

PAT HOLMES
816 SO 123RD
MILLARD, NEBR.

ANNABELL HOMAN
CROOKSTON, NEBR.

PRISCILLA HOY
3775 H
WALTON, NEBR.

HALLENE HUDDLESTUN
2111 S. 46 AVE.
OMAHA, NEBR.

VERA M. HULL
BOX 112
GORDON, NEBR.

MARIAN INNESS
1311 HARLAN DR.
BELLEVUE, NEBR.

MRS. LORETTA IWANSKI
BURWELL, NEBR.

DUANE W. IWEN
4917 N. 60TH ST.
OMAHA, NEBR. 68104

ALMA IWOHN
COURTHOUSE
FAIRBURY, NEBR.

NORMA JACKSON
1713 NORTH 59
OMAHA, NEBR.

MRS. HELEN JAMES
809 PINE HEIGHTS RD.
WAYNE, NEBR. 68787

MRS. FRANCES M. JENSEN
1105 SOUTH ST.
BLAIR, NEBR. 68008

KATHY JENSEN
JOHNSON, NEBR.

BEVERLY JOHNSON
SHICKLEY, NEBR.

CORINNE JOHNSON
BERTRAND, NEBR.

MARY BELLE JOHNSON
58 TRENRIDGE
LINCOLN, NEBR.

NORMA G. JOHNSON
UNIVERSITY OF NEBR.
NEBR. HALL 412
LINCOLN, NEBR.

CAROLYN JONES
1200 N "L"
FREMONT, NEBR.

MRS. EILEEN JORDAN
ARLINGTON, NEBR. 68002

RICHARD G. JORGENSEN
1414 SANDRA LANE
MILLARD, NEBR. 68043

FRIEDA JOSTEN
NELIGH, NEBR. 68756

JULIA JUNGREN
GOTHENBERG, NEBR.

SALLY KAEDING
3021 BURT #108
OMAHA, NEBR.

MRS. ALICE M. KALKWARF
807 OAK
CRETE, NEBR.

JOHANNA KASL
1142 JUNIPER
CRETE, NEBR. 68333

MARIETTA KAUF
514 FOREST BLVD,
HASTINGS, NEBR.

VLASTA KAVAN
752 E 6TH ST.
FREMONT, NEBR.

WINNIEFRED E. KELEHER
ROUTE 7
LINCOLN, NEBR. 68505

AGNES KELLY
BOX 101
VERDON, NEBR. 68457

MRS. JACK KENT, JR.
1304 22ND
AUBURN, NEBR.

ANNETTE KERVIN
2237 1/2 FRANKLIN ST.
BELLEVUE, NEBR.

WILMA KLEIN
HUMBOLDT, NEBR.

MRS. LINDA KLEINSCHMIDT
90 ROBERTS
SEWARD, NEBR. 68434

DORA KOESTER
SYRACUSE, NEBR.

ARLENE L. KOHOUT
925 S. 10TH
PLATTSMOUTH, NEBR.

RUTH KRAFKA
5552 MAYBERRY
OMAHA, NEBR.

MARY ANN KREIFELS
DUNBAR, NEBR.

MRS. AGNES KUCERA
CLARKSON, NEBR. 68629

MARY R. KYKER
28 FAIRVIEW DRIVE
YORK, NEBR.

MARGUERITE LANGAN
4110 VALLEY
OMAHA, NEBR.

MRS. JEAN M. LARSEN
ROUTE 2
WYMORE, NEBR. 68466

MISS SANDRA LAW
6421 FREMONT ST.
LINCOLN, NEBR. 68507

MRS. IRENE LEAHY
830 BROADWAY
TECUMSEH, NEBR.

RICHARD A. LEED
10 DELONG AVE.
COUNCIL BLUFFS, NEBR.

CHERYL LEEFERS
AVOCA, NEBR.

LAWRENCE LEMONS
801 HILLCREST DRIVE
SCOTTSBLUFF, NEBR.

MILDRED LEPPO
11 LYNNWOOD DR.
COUNCIL BLUFFS, IOWA

JUDITH J. LESSMANN
101 SO. 38TH AVE.
OMAHA, NEBR. 68131

MARY LICKTEIG
1922 SOUTH 55TH ST.
OMAHA, NEBR. 68106

MISS LORETTA LILLIE
4318 NO 65TH ST., APT. 7
OMAHA, NEBR.

MISS PAT LINSTROM
316 BANCROFT ST.
OMAHA, NEBR.

RUBY LOCKWOOD
BROCK, NEBR.

ELMA LOHRENZ
3114 10TH
KEARNEY, NEBR. 68847

MRS. CAROLYN LONG
BOX 261
SCOTTSBLUFF, NEBR.

SR. LORRAINE
ST. PETER & PAUL SCHOOL
FALLS CITY, NEBR.

MRS. EVELYN C. LOSKILL
2104 W. TWELFTH ST.
HASTINGS, NEBR. 68901

CAROL LUKENBACK
1511 3RD AVE.
SCOTTSBLUFF, NEBR.

MARY EILEEN McATEE
BOX 424
FULLERTON, NEBR.

ETHEL F. McCAMLEY
4618 BALDWIN AVE.
LINCOLN, NEBR. 68504

MRS. PATRICK McCARTHY
721 N. 32 ST.
OMAHA, NEBR.

ARCILLE McCLAREN
WAYNE, NEBR.

DAVID B. McCULLEY
3636 SOUTH 37TH ST.
LINCOLN, NEBR.

JOE McKEONE
COZAD CITY SCHOOLS
COZAD, NEBR.

RUTH McKINSTRY
912 FOURTH ST.
FAIRBURY, NEBR.

DOROTHY McMEEKIN
SHELBY, NEBR.

CRYSTAL McPHERSON
SYRACUSE, NEBR.

MARGARET MALONE
4000 LOCUST
LINCOLN, NEBR. 68516

MRS. JEANNE MARSH
2401 CHASE
FALLS CITY, NEBR.

MRS. ANN MARSHALL
ARLINGTON, NEBR. 68002

JESSIE E. MARSHALL
3824 PARKVIEW DR.
OMAHA, NEBR. 68134

JEAN MARTIN
674 N 58 ST.
OMAHA, NEBR.

VERAELLEN MARTIN
829 W BURNHAM
LINCOLN, NEBR. 68522

DOLORES MATHER
311 WEDGEWOOD DR.
LINCOLN, NEBR.

HELEN MAULER
ROUTE 2
MITCHELL, NEBR.

RONALD E. MEYER
5003 NICHOLAS ST.
OMAHA, NEBR. 68132

LORETTA MICKLE
4300 WITHERBEE
LINCOLN, NEBR.

SYLVIA L. MILLER
1409 5TH
AURORA, NEBR. 68818

VIVIAN MILLER
AINSWORTH, NEBR.

MRS. E. T. MIMS
1413 FAIRFAX R.
BELLEVUE, NEBR.

BARBARA MLINAR
ATKINSON, NEBR.

JO ANNE MONSERUD
312 S. 37TH ST. APT. 3
OMAHA, NEBR. 68131

ESTHER MONTGOMERY
501 SO. 13TH ST.
LINCOLN, NEBR.

MRS. OLIN MORRIS
MURRAY, NEBR.

BILL MORRISON
2601 PAWNEE
NORTH PLATTE, NEBR.

MRS. EMILY MUMM
BOX 235
YUTAN, NEBR.

MRS. BILL MUNN
1210 NORTH 45
LINCOLN, NEBR.

LILLIAN MUNTER
464 N. 16TH
LINCOLN, NEBR.

MYRTLE C. NELSON
R.F. D. 1
BLAIR, NEBR.

MRS. ARLYCE M. NORE
3446 SOUTH 126TH AVE.
OMAHA, NEBR. 68144

MRS. CATHARINE NORE
GENOA, NEBR.

MRS. IRENE A. ODELL
227 E 9TH ST.
WAHOO, NEBR. 68066

RUBY M. OLSEN
307 W 25 ST.
KEARNEY, NEBR.

MRS. RICHARD L. ORMAN
BOX 25
BURWELL, NEBR.

LOIS OSTRUSKE
606 E SECOND ST.
FREMONT, NEBR.

PHYLLIS PARELKA
BOX 709
VALENTINE, NEBR.

ANN PASEK
HUMBOLDT, NEBR.

VIOLA PATRICK
BOX 67
CRAIG, NEBR. 68019

MRS. EILEEN PAULSEN
CORDOVA, NEBR.

CLARA PEACOCK
340 JEFFERY DR.
LINCOLN, NEBR.

HILDEGARD PERSSON
1945 S ST.
LINCOLN, NEBR.

ROGER PETERSEN
1611 SOUTH STREET
BLAIR, NEBR.

THERESA A. PETERSEN
PLAINVIEW, NEBR.

WALTER J. PETERSON
WAYNE STATE COLLEGE
WAYNE, NEBR.

ROBERT B. PFEIFFER
DUNBAR, NEBR. 68346

LELA M. PIKE
SOUTH STAR
AINSWORTH, NEBR.

MRS. DELA POLSTON
5502 SO. 91 ST.
OMAHA, NEBR. 68127

JAMES E. PORTER
7605 ONTARIO
OMAHA, NEBR. 68124

A. MARGARET POWELL
13453 SPRING ST.
OMAHA, NEBR.

MARIE LOUISE PREVO
TILDEN, NEBR.

ALICE PROKES
ROUTE 2
SCHUYLER, NEBR.

RONALD L. PROPP
BOX 117
DEWITT, NEBR.

MRS. WALTER PRYSTAI
4355 DAVENPORT #11
OMAHA, NEBR. 68131

MRS. GENEVIEVE RAINE
GLENWOOD, IOWA 51534

JANICE RAINS
1915 2ND AVE.
NEBRASKA CITY, NEBR.

DALE D. RATHE
720 SO. 22ND
LINCOLN, NEBR.

MRS. DOROTHY REDFERN
OCONTO, NEBR. 68860

JOSIE REED
2914 PARKER ST.
OMAHA, NEBR.

PEARL REED
241 VINE ST.
COUNCIL BLUFFS, IOWA

DARLENE REHM
DEWITT, NEBR.

MARGUERITE REYNOLDS
125 NO. 39
OMAHA, NEBR.

MRS. DARLENE RICE
RR 2, BOX 31
FAIRBURY, NEBR. 68352

JUDIE RICHARDS
3900 EVERETT
LINCOLN, NEBR.

SHARON RINQUEST
1501 A
LINCOLN, NEBR.

DARLENE L. RISCHLING
3441 COOPER AVE.
LINCOLN, NEBR.

IMOGENE O. ROBERTS
2109 FIFTH AVE.
SCOTTSBLUFF, NEBR.

MRS. LOIS RONGISEH
323 MICHAEL DR.
GRETNA, NEBR.

CARLENE Y. ROSECRANS
ODELL, NEBRASKA

PHYLLIS E. ROSENQUIST
CERESCO, NEBR.

MARY ROWSON
4920 CAPITOL AVE.
OMAHA, NEBR.

BETTY RUSSO
2202 TULIP LANE
BELLEVUE, NEBR.

MRS. VERA RYAN-HORN
NEWMAN GROVE, NEBR.

MRS. ELLEN RYDER
1636 WASHINGTON ST.
BLAIR, NEBR.

SUSAN SAHN
2020 NO. 92ND AVE. #1
OMAHA, NEBR.

MRS. MILDRED SALAK
302 C ST.
SCHUYLER, NEBR.

MRS. NYEULAH SANDERS
219 SO. 19TH ST.
ORD, NEBR.

MARIANNE SANDVOLD
520 1/2 GRANT
HOLDREGE, NEBR. 68949

DARLENE SANTEE
3022 N 23 ST.
OMAHA, NEBR.

MRS. VERA L. SAPPENFIELD
1354 WILBUR
BLAIR, NEBR.

ALICE L. SAGERT
1625 D
LINCOLN, NEBR.

MRS. BETTY SAUNDERS
3219 NINTH AVE.
KEARNEY, NEBR.

THERESA MARIE SCANLON
CERESCO, NEBR.

MRS. VIVIAN SCHACHT
COOK, NEBR. 68329

JANET SCHACK
6931 "B" ST.
OMAHA, NEBR. 68106

MRS. DOROTHY SCHAEFER
1709 BROOKHAVEN
LINCOLN, NEBR.

HAZEL SCHMIDT
512 N. 4TH ST.
O'NEIL, NEBR.

LELAND SCHMIT JR.
903 HOPKINS DR.
BELLEVUE, NEBR.

MARJEAN SCHUBERT
824 WEST AVE. APT 5
HOLDREGE, NEBR. 68949

MRS. PL SCHUESSLER
11720 SO. 36 ST.
OMAHA, NEBR. 68123

MRS. CLARA A. SCHULZ
RR 2
SCHUYLER, NEBR.

KARLENE SENF
1625 B
LINCOLN, NEBR.

MRS. BARBARA SHAEFFER
3101 SOUTH ST.
LINCOLN, NEBR.

GLENN SHANEYFELT
905 WALNUT
NORFOLK, NEBR.

E. L. SHELDON
7240 DUDLEY
LINCOLN, NEBR. 68505

DALE SIEFKES
SHICKLEY, NEBR.

HELEN SIMPSON
229 MICHAEL DR.
GRETNA, NEBR.

RUTHELEN SITTLER
3421 HOLDREGE
LINCOLN, NEBR.

F. D. SLATER
7701 PACIFIC
OMAHA, NEBR. 68114

MRS. JEAN HERBERT SMITH
2600 WASHINGTON ST.
LINCOLN, NEBR.

MRS. LOIS SNYDER
RR 3
LINCOLN, NEBR.

RICHARD SPEARMAN
4010 FRAN AVE.
LINCOLN, NEBR. 68516

CARL SPENCER
2904 WASHINGTON
BELLEVUE, NEBR.

MRS. CLARA SPENCER
ROUTE 3
GIBBON, NEBR.

MARJORIE L. SPICKA
2942 MARTHA
OMAHA, NEBR.

HARVEY E. SPRINGER
3719 N. 71 ST.
OMAHA, NEBR. 68104

MARGUERITE STALTENBERG
1516 HILL ST.
PLATTSMOUTH, NEBR.

KAREN STEPHENSON
815 NORTHBOROUGH LANE
LINCOLN, NEBR. 68505

RONALD E. STOLLER
1020 SYCAMORE DR.
LINCOLN, NEBR.

MRS. EUNICE STUTHEIT
BRUNSWICK, NEBR.

CAROL SUDIK
4106 CUMMING
OMAHA, NEBR. 68131

MRS. M. KATHERINE SWAN
BOX 254
McCOOK, NEBR.

MRS. DORA V. TAYLOR
807 MAIN ST.
CHADRON, NEBR. 69337

HILDA M. TAYLOR
JOHNSTOWN, NEBR.

MRS. REBECCA J. TAYLOR
842 E 11TH
CRETE, NEBR.

MILDRED SCHLEIS TENOPIR
WILBER, NEBR.

SR. ALICE THERESE
STS. PETER & PAUL
FALLS CITY, NEBR.

VIRGINIA THOMPSON
CHADRON STATE COLLEGE
CHADRON, NEBR. 69337

MRS. FAITH TIEDGEN
ELBA, NEBR.

JOHN F. TIEDGEN
ELBA, NEBR.

DOROTHY E. TODD
MURRAY, NEBR.

ROY TOOTHAKER
UNIVERSITY OF OMAHA
OMAHA, NEBR. 68101

MRS. IELLENE TRACY
MASON CITY, NEBR. 68855

MAX TRADER
3418 DEWEY
OMAHA, NEBR.

AUDREY TRAUERNICHT
GRETNA, NEBR.

HELEN TUCKER
RFD 1, BOX 7
ALBION, NEBR.

ERMA J. UMBARGER
GENOA, NEBR.

MRS. NORMA L. VICE
SYRACUSE, NEBR.

MRS. EVELYN VINKENBERG
654 COMMERCIAL AVE.
SUPERIOR, NEBR.

MRS. MILDRED WAGENKNECHT
726 CENTRAL
HUMBOLDT, NEBR.

IVAN WAGGONER
403 W 7TH
GRAND ISLAND, NEBR. 68801

EDNA WAGNER
620 EAST 5TH ST.
FREMONT, NEBR.

MRS. KATHERINE J. WALKER
BOX 343
BERTRAND, NEBR. 68927

ESSIE B. WALL
706 LOGAN AVE.
BELLEVUE, NEBR.

MRS. HELEN S. WALTER
910 E 3RD
McCOOK, NEBR.

LOUISE C. WALTER
518 N ASH AVE.
HASTINGS, NEBR.

FRANCES WATTERS
2713 NO. 59
LINCOLN, NEBR.

ARLENE R. WEAVER
1315 W 6TH ST.
HASTINGS, NEBR. 68901

ESTHER I. WEBER
1003 W 9 ST.
SCHUYLER, NEBR. 68661

MRS. RACHEL WEINMAN
1415 L ST.
ORD, NEBR.

MRS. ELLEN WHITAKER
309 SOUTH 25TH ST.
BLAIR, NEBR. 68008

DUANE S. WIECHELMAN
1420 1/2 SO. 60TH ST.
OMAHA, NEBR.

SARAH WIELAND
354 HIGH ST.
TECUMSEH, NEBR. 68450

MRS. MARGARET E. WILCOX
1924 MONTEREY DR.
LINCOLN, NEBR. 68506

MARGARET WILSON
4025 IZARD
OMAHA, NEBR.

SHARON WILSON
BURWELL, NEBR.

SHELBY C. WININGHAM
401 1/2 EMERSON ST.
ALLIANCE, NEBR.

MRS. WANDA WITTMUSS
444 SO MADISON
PAPILLION, NEBR. 68046

IRENE YERG
709 1/2 ARTHUR
HOLDREGE, NEBR. 68949

MARK ZIMMERMAN
1216 - 13TH
AUBURN, NEBR.

COMMITTEE MEMBERS NOT LISTED PREVIOUSLY

DR. JOHN EWING
UNIVERSITY OF NEBR.
LINCOLN, NEBR.

MRS. ROMA HIATT
SCOTT-FORESMAN

DR. ALMA HOMZE
UNIVERSITY OF NEBR.
LINCOLN, NEBR.

MISS EDITH PEMBROOK
LINCOLN, NEBR.

MR. ROBERT BADEN
STATE DEPT. OF EDUCATION

MR. LOREN BRAKENHOFF
STATE DEPT. OF EDUCATION

MR. JOHN H. QUERY, JR.
STATE DEPT. OF EDUCATION

DR. KENNETH E. SHIBATA
McREL
LINCOLN AREA CENTER

SPEAKERS

DR. A. STERL ARTLEY
UNIVERSITY OF MISSOURI

DR. DOROTHY KENDALL BRACKEN
SOUTHERN METHODIST UNIVERSITY

DR. GEORGE D. SPACHE
UNIVERSITY OF FLORIDA

DR. RICHARD WATSON
KANSAS STATE COLLEGE
PITTSBURG, KANSAS

APPENDIX C

FINANCIAL REPORT
(Registration Fees Collected from Conferees)

Receipts:

March 1, 1967.....	203.75	
March 7, 1967.....	694.30	
March 15, 1967.....	250.25	
March 21, 1967.....	145.25	
March 29, 1967.....	137.25	
April 3, 1967.....	152.00	
April 6, 1967.....	96.25	
Total Receipts from Conferees.....		1,679.50

Expenditures:

Refunds to those who notified us of non-attendance before the workshop was held		
Ethel Brooks.....	4.00	
Mrs. Kent May.....	4.00	
Mrs. Pauline Larsen....	2.50	
A.A.A. Rents (Ashtrays).....	3.00	
Kings Food Host (Catering - 2 Days)....	936.25	
Lincoln Public School Board of Education (Rental of General Arnold School, Janitor Service & Maintenance).	218.52	
Printing of Report & Postage for Mailing....	510.78	
Total Expenditures.....		1,679.05
TOTAL RECEIPTS.....		1,679.05
TOTAL EXPENDITURES.....		1,679.05
BALANCE.....		00.00

Respectfully submitted,

Kenneth E. Shibata

KENNETH E. SHIBATA, Coordinator
McREL, Lincoln Area Center

APPENDIX D

Comments from Kenneth E. Shibata

The Lincoln Area Center of the Mid-continent Regional Educational Laboratory extends its congratulations to the State Department of Education for the opportunity to join with them in sponsoring the Statewide Reading Workshop. We especially appreciate the services of Mr. Jack Query who was instrumental in making the "idea" become "real."

As is the case, when many are involved in assuming responsibilities at this magnitude, all does not go as planned.

One of my personal responsibilities was to make sure all people who attended the workshop would be registered with name, address and school. This was necessary to enable reports to be sent to all who registered as well as other obvious reasons.

Unfortunately, during the clean-up period some of the registration slips were lost. I assume full responsibility for this.

My apologies and only recourse is for all of you to pass the word on to your colleagues and ask them to write me personally. I will see that they receive their copy of the Final Report.

Kenneth E. Shibata
5848 Randolph
Lincoln, Nebraska

STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION

Norman Otto, President.....Millard
Frank E. Landis, Vice President.....Lincoln
Allen P. Burkhardt.....Norfolk
Robert G. Simmons, Jr. .....Scottsbluff
John A. Wagoner.....Grand Island
Lloyd V. Wright.....Reynolds

* * * * * * * * * *

MID-CONTINENT REGIONAL EDUCATIONAL LABORATORY ADVISORY BOARD

Walter K. Beggs, Chairman.....Lincoln
Kenneth E. Shibata, Coordinator.....Lincoln
Rev. James Dawson.....Lincoln
LeRoy Ortgiesen.....Lincoln
Richard Brown.....Holdrege
Kenneth Gardner.....Falls City
Neal Gomon.....Peru
Vance Hinrichs.....Seward
John Lynch.....Lincoln
Floyd Miller.....Lincoln
David Osterhout.....Crete
Lewis Patrick.....Fairbury
Lloyd Sexton.....Fremont
Larry Vaughn.....Lincoln
Steven Watkins.....Lincoln
Wayne Wiegert.....Lincoln

*This publication has been made possible by registration fees of the participants in the conference.